3 1761 02095662 9

VICTORIAE UNIVERSITAS
ABEUNT STUDIA IN MORES

The Library
of
Victoria University.

Source The author

Accession No. 9531
Class No.
Book No.

Presented to
The Victoria University
Toronto
by the Author
Jos. Agar Beet
Richmond
London, 8 Nov. 95.

THROUGH CHRIST TO GOD

A STUDY IN SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY

By the same Author.

Just published, uniform with this volume, 6*s.* 6*d.*

THE NEW LIFE IN CHRIST:

A Study in Personal Religion.

COMMENTARIES ON THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.

ROMANS. Eighth Edition, 7*s.* 6*d.*

CORINTHIANS. Sixth Edition, 10*s.* 6*d.*

GALATIANS. Fourth Edition, 5*s.*

EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND PHILEMON. New Edition, Third Thousand, 7*s.* 6*d.*

"An able and scholarly piece of work, and brings out with admirable clearness the logical sequence of the Apostle's thought."—*The Academy.*

Fifth Edition. Crown 8*vo, cloth*, 1*s.*

HOLINESS AS UNDERSTOOD BY THE WRITERS OF THE BIBLE.

Second Edition. Crown 8*vo, cloth*, 1*s.*

A TREATISE ON CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

LONDON: HODDER & STOUGHTON.

THROUGH CHRIST TO GOD

A STUDY IN SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY

BY

JOSEPH AGAR BEET, D.D.

THIRD THOUSAND

London
HODDER AND STOUGHTON
27, PATERNOSTER ROW

MDCCCXCV

BT
75
B36

MANUEL

STOR

"Let us begin by asking whether all this which they call the universe is left to the guidance of unreason and chance medley, or on the contrary, as our fathers have declared, is ordered and governed by a marvellous intelligence and wisdom."—PLATO.

9531

PREFACE.

THIS volume is a statement, in part, of the Gospel of Christ and of His teaching about Himself and God; and an argument proving that this statement reproduces correctly the actual teaching of Christ and proving that His teaching is true. It is an attempt to show that by a strictly historical and scientific and philosophical method definite and assured results may be reached touching the unseen foundations of religion.

Such a work belongs to Systematic Theology. For it contains definite statements arranged in order so as to convey one harmonious conception. In the series of which this is the first volume, I hope to give, in short outline, an exposition of all that is known by man touching the unseen basis of religion, thus covering the whole chief matter of Systematic Theology. This work belongs equally to Christian Evidences. For step by step these statements are supported by what claims to be conclusive argument. In other words I endeavour to prove that the orderly statements here given represent objective reality.

This close interweaving of Apologetics and Systematic Theology is of the utmost importance. In all other departments of human knowledge, exposition and proof go together. For there cannot be effective argument without clear statement of that which is proved. And in Theology, as in other branches of knowledge, statements are of value only so far as they are supported by evidence.

This method explains much in the present volume. The assumptions on which my arguments rest are plainly stated, are known by direct observation, and for the more part are universally accepted. I have made no statements for which I do not bring, or point to, evidence. And the confidence of my assertions is measured, not always by my own conviction, which is frequently much stronger than the words I use, but by the conclusiveness of the evidence adduced. Consequently, my refusal to pronounce judgment on certain points, and apparent hesitation on some other matters, must not be taken as implying doubt in my own mind. They mean only that at the moment I am not prepared to bring conclusive evidence, and that in these points definite assertion is not needful for my argument.

It will however be noticed that on all the main points discussed I speak with complete confidence, because I adduce what seems to me to be decisive proof.

That I have not assumed (see pages 363 ff) the infallibility of the Bible or of the Church, gives to this volume special fitness to the needs of the present day. For its argument is not affected by theories of Church order, or by recent Biblical criticism. As revealing an independent foundation of the Christian hope, it is calculated to give rest to many who are not prepared to accept, or able to disprove, some statements of modern Biblical scholars. And it sets forth the only sure ground of Christian union—viz. the one Faith in the One Lord.

Biblical Theology occupies a large place in this work. I have endeavoured throughout to reproduce the various conceptions of the various writers of the New Testament about Christ and the Gospel. The deep harmony underlying these various conceptions has been to us a proof of their truth. Thus Biblical Theology has afforded an important link in our argument. This method of research has revealed the great importance of this department of Theology, which in days gone by has been seriously underrated; and has revealed also its subordinate position as compared with Systematic or Doctrinal Theology, which subordinate position has been somewhat overlooked in our own day. As setting forth, if the Christian argument be sound, the eternal realities underlying all outward forms of religion, Systematic

Doctrinal Theology must ever be the goal and crown of all Theological and Biblical Research.

As claiming to announce results resting upon reliable evidence, this book is a reply to the Agnosticism which asserts, or more frequently silently assumes, that religion has to do only with matters of sentiment or speculation or imagination lying outside the realm of human knowledge. And, inasmuch as we have found results differing altogether from the ordinary course of nature, it is a reply to the Rationalism which denies the supernatural or denies that the supernatural has revealed itself in nature.

The wide extent of ground covered has necessarily made my treatment of details somewhat scanty. But I hope that though scanty it will be found to be thorough so far as it goes. My purpose has been not so much to deal exhaustively with any one topic as to exemplify what seems to me to be the correct method of theological research, and to look at the various elements of the Gospel as mutually related and as related to other branches of human knowledge. For instance, my scanty treatment of the argument for the existence of God is designed chiefly to exemplify the relation of Natural Theology to the historic revelation given to men in Christ.

Part of the ground occupied by this volume has already been covered by my *Fernley Lecture* on *The Credentials of the Gospel.* An outline of the same, for Sunday School Teachers, is given in my *Firm*

Foundation of the Christian Faith. With these earlier volumes certain parts of the present work are almost identical. And all three volumes reveal, in different degrees of development, the same method and plan.

The lectures now published have been given to my students. They are designed to be first steps in accurate study of Systematic Doctrinal Theology. But, though intended primarily for theological students, I hope they will be found useful to intelligent men and women of various positions in life who desire to know all they can about the great realities on which rests the Christian hope. At the same time, as embodying original research I hope they will be found not unworthy of the attention of advanced students.

My obligations to other writers are so many and various and great that I find myself unable to specify them. My obligations to works on Exposition and on Biblical Theology are much greater than to works on Doctrinal Theology. This last and highest department rests upon the simpler and easier department mentioned above, and must therefore, in scientific research, be preceded by them. We therefore need not wonder that Exposition and Biblical Theology have made more progress than Doctrinal Theology. At the same time, this last department is not only the highest ultimate goal of the earlier departments

but is demanded by the spiritual needs of the Church of Christ. In all Theological research this ultimate aim must ever be kept in view. It is the special object of this volume.

My quotations from the Bible have been in some cases taken from the Revised Version, modified not unfrequently so as to reproduce some shade of meaning conveyed by the original; in other cases, they are my own free rendering. In each case I have sought to reproduce as fully as possible, especially in reference to the matter in hand, the sense intended by the Sacred Writers. Similarly, in quotations from the Greek and Latin classics I have used or modified published translations as best suited my purpose, or have given a translation of my own.

The present series of lectures is designed to be followed by others. This volume deals with the great fundamental doctrines of the Gospel. And, since these are more or less controverted, it is, in great part, argumentative. The next will give an account of *The New Life in Christ*; and will supplement this volume by presenting the Gospel as a power working in, and transforming, the heart of man. The two volumes together will deal with the Theology of personal religion. They will, I hope, be followed by a third discussing *The Church of Christ*. This will supplement the volumes on personal religion by an account of the collective spiritual life of the servants

of Christ. The whole will be completed by a fourth volume on *The Last Things*, the final and glorious consummation of the spiritual work whose foundations were laid by Christ and in Christ, which must be embraced by each individual believer, which during long ages has been bearing visible and abundant fruit in the Church of Christ, and which will be the eternal joy of men and of angels and of God.

Such as it is, with many imperfections for which I must plead indulgence on the ground of the difficulty of my task, I submit this result of much toil to the judgment of those who, like myself, are scholars and worshippers in the School of Christ.

RICHMOND,
26th September, 1892

PREFACE
TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THIS edition is little more than a corrected reprint of the former one.

The reference on page 16 to the personality of God, which does not convey my meaning clearly, has been rewritten. I wished for a simple and intelligible, yet accurate, definition of personality. This I find in the marked contrast between men and animals. The former we call *persons*, but not the latter. Personality

I therefore define to be that which men have and animals have not, that which distinguishes men from animals. It includes intelligence, self-determination, and the moral sense. Now I have endeavoured to prove that the Source of the universe must be in every respect superior to everything derived from that Source; and, if so, superior to man. Consequently, if man, as superior to animals, is a person, God is also, with still better claim, a Person. We are therefore justified in speaking of Him as such.

The term *person* as applied to God is referred to again on page 317 of my recently published volume, *The New Life in Christ.*

Objection has been taken to my attempt, on pp. 262, 263, to illustrate the mutual relation of the Persons of the Godhead by the analogy of a commercial partnership. The fitness of this illustration is matter of taste; and on such matters opinions differ and argument is of little use. Now all analogies between man and God fall infinitely below the reality of God; and are therefore unworthy. And they are liable to be seriously misunderstood. Yet without such analogies, expressed or assumed, I do not think that men can apprehend God. A great part of the teaching of the Bible about God is anthropomorphic. And in the New Testament the mysterious relation between the First and Second Persons of the Trinity is set forth constantly by an analogy derived from the human relation of father and son.

The real question is whether the comparison I have used helps to make the mysterious Three-One God in

any measure more intelligible to us. A very serious objection to the doctrine of the Trinity is that it is absolutely incomprehensible and unthinkable, that the mind can give to the words which enunciate it no real meaning, and that therefore these words are but empty sounds. It is therefore all important that a teacher who speaks about Three Divine Persons and One God should make quite clear in what sense he uses these words, and should show that his teaching does not involve a contradiction in terms.

My comparison proves that three distinct persons may be so related that in action they are practically one. That this is a mere human example, does not invalidate it. For all that is good in man has an eternal counterpart and pattern in God. The unity of the Father and the Son is made by Christ in John xvii. 11, 21-23, a pattern of the oneness of His followers for which He prays. This implies an analogy between the oneness of the Father and the Son and that of man with man. I do but carry the comparison a step further, from the inner unity of believers to a familiar and useful union in the outward life of men.

The illustration I have used also presents an aspect of the Trinity conspicuous in the New Testament but often overlooked in theological works, viz. that the unity of the Godhead finds expression in each divine Person. In the teaching of Paul the One God is not the Three-One but the Father. So 1 Cor. viii. 6, "To us there is one God, the Father . . . and one Lord, Jesus Christ;" and in Eph. iv. 6, after a

list of unities, including the "one Spirit" and the "one Lord," we read of "one God and Father of all." Similarly, in 1 Cor. xii. 4-6, we find "the same Spirit . . . the same Lord . . . the same God." In these passages, the unity of the Godhead finds expression in the teaching that each divine Person stands alone in His own plane. This truth is emphasised in my illustration. And I am careful to note the point at which the comparison fails.

A refusal to use human analogies as an aid to understand God is, in my view, a serious defect in Dr. Dale's able volume on *Christian Doctrine*. In his discourse on *The Trinity* he does nothing to help us to understand in what sense there are in the unity of the Godhead Three divine Persons. Yet without such intelligent apprehension I do not see how the doctrine of the Trinity can be of practical use.

A sequel to the volume now reprinted is found in the new volume referred to above. In the earlier work I have set forth the objective and historical ground of the Christian faith: in the later one I have endeavoured to describe *The New Life in Christ* which rests securely on this firm foundation. The one portrays what God has done for us in Christ; the other, what He does for us by the Holy Spirit. Taken together, the two volumes give an account of the Theology of Personal Religion.

RICHMOND, *8th August*, 1895.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

PRELIMINARIES.

PAGE

LECT. I. **Religion and Theology** 1

Definition of Religion—Definition of Theology—Theology is a Science and a Philosophy—Its relation to Religion—To Ethics—Method of Research.

LECT. II. **The Visible reveals the Invisible beyond and above it** 10

The Visible World—Not self-existent—Is it a Work of Art?—The Maker must be greater than all that He has made—Lifeless, living, rational—Unexplained phenomena—Nature educates—Reveals a Personal God—Testimony of Plato and Cicero.

LECT. III. **This Testimony is confirmed by the Moral Sense** 21

Moral judgments are not under our control—Nor from human legislation—Nor from observation of consequences—Three groups of unexplained phenomena—Nature develops moral qualities—Its source must be intelligent and moral—Testimony of Sophocles, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Cicero.

LECT. IV. **Retribution beyond the Grave** 30

Retribution in the present life is irregular—Ancient explanation—Xenophon, Plato, Buddhist Canon—A universal Revelation of God to man—Consciousness of personal sin—We need pardon and liberation.

PAGE

LECT. V. **Christianity and Christ** 38
Various religions of the world — Immense superiority of the Christian nations—Their sustained progress—Invalid objections —The Jewish race—Jesus of Nazareth.

LECT. VI. **The Christian Documents** . . . 50
The letters of Paul—The Four Gospels—Method of Research—Types of New Testament Teaching.

LECT. VII. **The Moral Teaching of Christ** . . . 59
An unseen Creator and Ruler—Retribution beyond the grave—Lofty moral teaching—A perfect Example.

PART II.

JUSTIFICATION THROUGH FAITH.

LECT. VIII. **The Fundamental Gospel of Paul** . . 65
The Epistle to the Romans—A fundamental principle.

LECT. IX. **Righteousness and Law** 69
Two groups of words—Righteousness—The Law of God—Its historical and literary form—The law written on the heart—A decisive authority.

LECT. X. **Universal Sin and Ruin** 79
All have sinned—The Law cannot save—The result—The Law is a preparation for the Gospel—A door of hope.

LECT. XI. **Righteousness through Faith** . . . 87
Romans i. 17, iii. 21, 22—Righteousness of God—God's gift of Righteousness—Justified through faith—Faith reckoned for righteousness—Pardon—Reconciled to God—Does not denote an inward change.

PAGE

LECT. XII. **The Nature of Faith** 105

Faith and belief—Object-matter and personal object of faith—Elements of character required in personal object—The Old Testament—The Greek equivalent—Justifying Faith.

LECT. XIII. **The Gospel of Christ** 119

The Fourth Gospel—The Synoptist Gospels—Peter—The Old Testament—Salvation by Faith actually taught by Christ.

LECT. XIV. **Faith and Works** 129

Two lines of Teaching—Harmony found in the object-matter of saving faith—Two justifications—Conversion—Repentance.

LECT. XV. **Results attained** 139

PART III.

THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

LECT. XVI. **The Teaching of Paul** 143

Salvation comes through the violent death of Christ—He died by His own deliberate purpose—His death was caused by man's sin.

LECT. XVII. **Redemption and Propitiation** 149

The death of Christ is the costly means of our liberation—Evangelical Redemption—Propitiation in the Old Testament and in Homer—Evangelical Propitiation.

LECT. XVIII. **The Justice of God** 157

Romans iii. 26—A hindrance, in the Justice of God, to man's justification—And in the Law of God—Christ died to remove it.

LECT. XIX. **Reconciliation to God** 165

Frequent teaching of Paul—Sinners are exposed to God's hostility to sin—Yet reconciliation is by the gift of God.

PAGE

LECT. XX. **The Epistle to the Hebrews** 172
Frequent teaching—A testament made valid by the testator's death.

LECT. XXI. **Other New Testament Teaching** . . . 176
Christ must needs go to Jerusalem and die—His deliberate purpose to die—The blood shed for forgiveness of sins—The Lamb of God—The Epistles of John and Peter, and the Book of Revelation—Agreement of many witnesses.

LECT. XXII. **The Rationale of the Atonement** . . 187
Why could not God pardon sin by royal prerogative?—When the guilty goes free, the innocent suffers—The love of God forbad such pardon—How can the death of the Innocent make just the pardon of the guilty? Not simply by revealing the love of God—The death of Christ revealed the inevitable sequence of sin and death — Zaleucus — Englishmen at Marathon — An imperfect explanation does not weaken the facts.

LECT. XXIII. **For whom did Christ die?** 204
For the whole race—Adam and Christ—Other New Testament teaching—Yet He died specially for His sheep.

LECT. XXIV. **Results attained** 211

PART IV.

THE SON OF GOD.

LECT. XXV. **Paul's Conception of Christ** . . . 215
The Son of God—The Judge of the World—Equal in moral worth to the race—Christ and Adam—Creator of the World—Head of the Church—The Epistle to the Hebrews.

LECT. XXVI. **The Fourth Gospel** 223
Another type of teaching—Christ claims superhuman dignity—The Only-begotten Son—He is called God—The Book of Revelation.

PAGE

LECT. XXVII. **The Synoptist Gospels** 231

The Son of God—The Son of Man will judge the world—The Book of Acts—The Son is without beginning and without limit, and therefore divine.

LECT. XXVIII. **The Son is equal to, and distinct from, the Father** 240

Making Himself equal to God—The form of God—Christ shares to the full the attributes of God—The eternal and beloved companion of God.

LECT. XXIX. **The Son is subordinate to the Father** . 248

The title *God* reserved for the Father—The subordinate position of the Son—The Eternal Son, derived from, and devoted to, the Father—The Father greater than the Son.

LECT. XXX. **The Unity of the Father and the Son** . 256

The one God, the one Lord, the one Spirit—The oneness of Father and Son is the archetype of Christian unity—An illustration—A new and definite conception of God—It came from Christ.

LECT. XXXI. **The Incarnation of the Son of God** . . 270

He became poor, and emptied Himself—He became like His brethren, became flesh—Supernatural birth—The holy Boy—Baptism of the Spirit—Human limitations—Latent divine attributes.

LECT. XXXII. **The Unanimous Belief of the Churches** . 282

The Creed of Nicæa—The Second Council—The Nicene Creed universally accepted—Apollinaris, Nestorius, Eutyches—The Definition of Faith—The Nestorian, Coptic, and Armenian Churches.

LECT. XXXIII. **Results attained** 292

PART V.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

PAGE

LECT. XXXIV. **The Belief of Paul** 301

Paul accepted Christ as divine because he believed that He had risen from the dead—A bodily resurrection—Resurrection implies ascension—The Epistle to the Hebrews.

LECT. XXXV. **The Book of Acts** 311

Paul at Antioch and Athens—Peter at Pentecost—The First Epistle of Peter.

LECT. XXXVI. **The Four Gospels** 317

Christ foretells His resurrection—The empty grave and the Risen Lord—Differences and agreement.

LECT. XXXVII. **Proof that Christ actually rose** . . 322

Summary of foregoing facts—If Christ rose, all the facts are explained—He must have been dead—Delusion would have been detected—It would not account for the effect of Christianity—Not a mere supernatural vision—Christ is both divine and risen.

LECT. XXXVIII. **Objections** 339

This argument is not affected by other statements in the Bible, or by discrepancies, or by the results of Criticism — Objection to miracles—Observed forces cannot account for the origin of life or of reason—The resurrection of Christ is no greater miracle than these—The slow progress of Christianity.

LECT. XXXIX. **Summary of Results** 360

Christ rose from the dead, claimed to be the Son of God, announced forgiveness of sins—Authority of the Bible—The grounds of the Christian Faith—Moral and spiritual results—Spiritual needs not yet supplied.

PART I.

PRELIMINARIES.

LECTURE I.

RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

FEW words have greater import in modern life and thought than the word RELIGION. And few general terms convey a more definite sense. We know at once what is meant by a religious man or a religious question and by the various religions of mankind. On the other hand, in the English Bible the word is rare, and is not always used in the same sense. In Acts xxvi. 5, Jas. i. 26, 27 it represents a Greek word denoting an outward form of worship: in Gal. i. 13, 14 the term "Jews' religion" represents the Greek original of our word *Judaism*: and in Acts xiii. 43 the word *religious* is suitably replaced in the Revised Version by the word *devout*. The rarity of the word in the Bible and its frequency and definiteness in modern speech point to this last as the standard which must determine our definition of it. For the word at once suggests its modern meaning: and there

is nothing to gain by attempting to set this aside in favour of its meaning in the few passages in which it is found in the English Bible.

Frequent and in the main definite as is the use of the word *religion* in modern life, to mark out precisely the area of thought covered by it is by no means easy. For, however well understood in their broad significance, the exact sense conveyed by popular abstract terms is, in consequence of the various and varying use of various speakers, almost always somewhat indefinite. In other words, popular usage is a standard of meaning very difficult to apply. Definitions of popular abstract terms are little more than the writer's own use of the word in question. Consequently, almost every fresh work on religion propounds a novel definition of the term. This work is no exception. I cannot proceed without stating the sense I wish to convey by the word before us. But I think that the definition here given marks off an area of thought always covered by the word *religion* whenever used; and that it includes the whole area common to its various uses. It is therefore as wide, and as narrow, as the common use of the word permits.

RELIGION, as I understand it, is SUCH CONCEPTION OF THE UNSEEN AS MAKES FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Imperfect and in some respects unsatisfactory as is this definition, it is yet sufficient to form a basis for my definition of Theology, and thus to mark out the scope of the present work.

In this definition, Religion is not a mode of action,

moral or ritual, but a frame of mind. Actions are religious not in themselves but in virtue of the inward thought from which they spring. At the same time, the religious frame of mind is one ever ready to reveal itself in various outward expressions of reverence, in beneficence, and in righteousness. It is a thought which dominates, or tends to dominate, the whole man. Religion is therefore a CONCEPTION.

A distinctive feature of religion is that it ever goes out after, takes hold of, and draws nourishment from, things beyond reach of human sight. A religious man is one who looks "not at the things seen but at the things not seen." These he ponders; and by them he is influenced. An irreligious man is one influenced only by the things of the present life. Religion thus differs, on the one hand, from Natural Science, which observes, describes, and arranges phenomena, *i.e.* things which appear; and on the other hand from morality, which is religious only so far as the moralist goes beyond the limits of the Seen in search of motives for right doing. Religion is therefore a Conception OF THE UNSEEN.

Another distinguishing feature is that religion appeals to, and strengthens, the Moral Sense; and thus makes for Righteousness. In this respect it differs from empty superstition which degrades, and from mere curious speculation about things lying beyond the horizon of observation which does nothing to elevate. This limitation of the word *religion* to something ennobling is perhaps not universal. But I think it is usual; and it seems to me convenient. Certainly the word *irre-*

ligious is almost always a term of reproach. We shall therefore do well to limit its opposite to something good. Religion is therefore such Conception of the Unseen as MAKES FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Looked at from another point of view, religion may be defined as man's SELF-SURRENDER to such conception of the unseen as makes for righteousness. Certainly upon this self-surrender depends the practical benefit of the religious conception. But, as matter of fact, no man who has mentally grasped the unseen realities is uninfluenced by them. For the religious conception is never altogether inactive. We may therefore speak of the conception itself, so potent in its influence, as religion; assuming that, wherever this conception is, it will in some measure influence and raise its possessor.

In this definition, no mention is made of GOD. To the Christian, the thought of a personal God is that which in the unseen world occupies the largest place and most makes for righteousness. But in the ancient world, away from Israel and from Christianity, there have been men without any definite knowledge of, or confidence in, a personal God yet profoundly conscious of an invisible world and of a life beyond the grave and finding in this consciousness of the unseen a strong motive for right doing. As an example, I may mention Buddha as he is depicted in the Buddhist Sacred Canon. Certainly the man who gave up the pleasures of life to seek beyond the grave an endless rest and who proclaimed right doing as the path to rest must be

called religious. Yet he disowned any knowledge of a personal Creator and Ruler.

It is right to say that Buddha believed firmly in moral sequences beyond man's control and absolutely inevitable. Thus his religion was a conception of an Unseen greater than himself: and his religious life was acceptance of this SUPERIOR POWER as his guide in thought and action. But this conception of a superior Power is involved in the word *righteousness*, which as we shall see denotes conformity to an authoritative standard. Moreover, the only conception of the Unseen which makes for righteousness is a conception of the Unseen as superior to the seen. Consequently our definition of religion involves self-surrender to this higher and unseen authority. But, as already implied, it was needless to state this in a definition.

The above definition does not assume that the conception of the Unseen which makes for righteousness is TRUE, *i.e.* that it has a corresponding reality. For I do not wish, in framing a definition, to discuss whether a false conception can strengthen the moral sense and thus make for righteousness. Any conception of the Unseen, whether true or false, which makes men better and enables them better to do the work of life may fairly be called religion.

On the other hand, all analogy of human life assures us that a true conception, *i.e.* one which corresponds with reality, is a better guide of action than a false one, *i.e.* than a conception in conflict with reality. Indeed all experience tells us that, as guides, the one is safe,

the other most dangerous. This wide experience compels us to believe that, if any conception of the Unseen be a gain to man, as it must be if it makes for righteousness, it will be a gain in proportion to its truth. And, if so, it is for man's highest interest to bring his conception of the Unseen into closest possible agreement with the unseen Realities.

Once more. The moral sense of man, however imperfectly educated, is to every one, until better educated, a SUPREME LAW. To that voice of authority he is bound, under penalty of moral degradation, to yield implicit obedience. This suggests very strongly that whatever strengthens the moral sense is in some measure in harmony with unseen reality. Certainly it goes a long way to prove that whatever is morally hurtful cannot be true. Thus in some degree the moral sense of man becomes to him a standard of truth in reference to things unseen. As itself intensely real, and of more worth than all material good, it is necessarily in essential harmony with the greatest realities with which man has to do. But this standard must be used with utmost caution. For truth and error are so strangely mingled, and the Unseen is so intangible, that frequently we cannot distinguish the helpful and hurtful elements of a given conception. Consequently, as a test of truth, the moral sense needs to be supplemented by other evidence.

These considerations prove indisputably that it is for the highest interests of man that his moral sense be illumined by a knowledge of the unseen realities as

accurate and extensive as possible. Such accurate and full conception of the unseen is the aim of theological research.

The word THEOLOGY is not found in the Bible. Etymologically it denotes a discourse about God. But etymology does very little to determine the meaning of popular terms. For, whatever their origin, they gather round themselves from popular usage a more or less definite sense. Moreover, Religion and Theology are so closely related that the meaning given to the one term must in great part fix the meaning of the other. In harmony with the definition of Religion given above, I understand by THEOLOGY a branch of human knowledge embracing WHATEVER WE KNOW ABOUT THAT UNSEEN WHICH MAKES FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS. By Systematic Theology I mean an orderly statement of our knowledge of the Unseen, *i.e.* a statement in which its various parts are placed together in their essential relation.

In this work I shall treat Theology as a SCIENCE: for I shall gather together and describe and arrange in order matters known by direct observation and for the more part universally admitted; and from these only will my conclusions be derived. I shall treat it as a PHILOSOPHY: for I shall use our deductions from observed facts as an avenue of approach to those broad principles which underlie religious phenomena and all phenomena. As a department of human knowledge, it touches all other departments of the same. For whatever is known stands in relation to whatever else

is known. As professing to set before man the noblest aim of human effort, an aim which demands unreserved devotion, and to reveal a universe which will exist in undimmed glory when the visible universe is but a memory of the past, Theology claims to be the highest department of human knowledge. It is an effort to obtain, reflected amid the perishing world around us and in the subjective world of man's own inner life, a vision of realities lofty beyond compare and enduring for ever.

The relation of THEOLOGY to RELIGION is now evident. Without Theology there cannot be Religion. For every one who is influenced for good by the Unseen must have ideas about the Unseen. In proportion to his intelligence and to the influence of these ideas over him will they be definite and orderly. These ideas are Theology. On the other hand, a man may perhaps be a theologian without being religious. For possibly his conception of the Unseen may fail to elevate his moral life, and thus make for righteousness. But this failure will almost certainly dim or distort his conception of those Realities to whose moral authority he refuses to submit.

To the Science of ETHICS, Theology is most closely related. For the unseen moral world within us is linked by subtle bonds to the unseen world above. In the Moral Sense the theologian hears the voice of an unseen and personal Ruler. And from that Unseen One in all ages the most effective moral teaching has derived its authority.

The above account of Theology indicates the method which in this work I shall pursue. We shall collect and describe and arrange facts which cannot be explained by the various forces observed operating in the material world and in human life around and within us, and which therefore reveal the operation of forces other than these. From these observed facts we shall endeavour to advance by cautious steps to principles underlying them, and from these to still broader principles. And occasionally we shall note the bearing of these principles on the inner and outer life of man.

To this sacred study, involving our highest interests, I now invite my readers.

LECTURE II.

THE VISIBLE REVEALS THE INVISIBLE BEYOND AND ABOVE IT.

THE first object which attracts the thought of man is the VISIBLE WORLD around him consisting of objects lifeless and living and rational in endless variety, many of them clothed in a beauty which enchants us and others revealing an adaptation to useful ends which evokes our highest admiration. Continued observation increases our wonder. Wherever we look we see objects which promise to repay abundantly our most careful study.

The complexity and the constant change of the universe suggest very strongly, or compel us to believe, that it is NOT SELF-EXISTENT, BUT DERIVED. We eagerly ask, Whence came this wonderful panorama which fills us with delight?

Amid natural objects which no human hand has made, we notice the works of man. And of these last we notice that the best are produced only by deliberate design. They existed first as a subjective thought in the mind before they became objective and outward actualities. In many cases the thought was gradually

developed before its realisation began. Examples of this are seen in the successive sketches preparatory to a great picture, and in the gradually evolved plan of a great literary work. All the best works of man are products of careful thought as well as of patient toil. And in every case the worker is immensely greater than his best work. Our admiration of the picture is always admiration of the painter.

We now ask, Is the material universe an exception to this universal generalisation? Are the natural objects which evoke a wonder surpassing that with which we view the noblest works of man themselves products of intelligence and therefore a WORK OF ART, or only results of the operation of BLIND AND UNCONSCIOUS FORCES? Do they reveal the hand of a Worker as much greater than man as the universe around us surpasses the noblest works of man, or have they no significance beyond their mere utility and pleasantness? Is the man of genius himself an offspring of senseless forces? If so, man's study of nature, so elevating to that in him which is noblest and best, is but a contemplation of something infinitely inferior to himself.

Against this supposition, every instinct of our nature rebels. The splendour of nature, surpassing all that man can make and prompting his own best thoughts and works, proclaims in words we cannot misunderstand that behind and above the material world is a Worker as much above Nature as the artist is greater than his picture and as much above man as the vast and glorious

universe is greater than the noblest works of man. The edifice itself bears witness to the resources and the skill of the Architect.

This testimony is not weakened by the fact that the DEVELOPMENT of living objects is going on before our eyes, and can be in some measure explained by the operation of known and constant forces. We already know something about the reproduction of flowers. And the above argument will remain in full force even if it be proved that all varieties of flowers have been produced by the operation of natural forces; just as our wonder at a manufactured article is not lessened when we see the automatic machine by which it was made. We ask at once, Who made the machine? And we wonder at his skill. The theologian asks, Whence came the natural forces which produced the beautiful world around us? Who gave them their original impulse, and directed the mode of their operation? To these questions, Nature's only answer is that the MAKER must be GREATER than all that He has MADE.

The presumption thus elicited is strengthened by other facts recently observed. The rocks beneath our feet afford complete proof that our planet was not always as it is now, that animals existed long before man, that to speak generally the lower forms of animal and vegetable life are earlier than the higher, and that there was a time when our planet was destitute of even the lowest forms of Life. In other words, the broad divisions of LIFELESS, LIVING, and RATIONAL, so

conspicuous in the world to-day, mark off in their appearance on the scene three great epochs in the history of our globe.

Another great fact in the realm of Natural Science demands attention. The most careful scrutiny has failed to detect a TRANSITION now from the LIFELESS to the LIVING. So far as has yet been observed, wherever there is life it has been derived from pre-existing life. And the known forces of nature are utterly inadequate either to produce out of inorganic matter the mysterious chemical compounds which make up living bodies, or to form them into organic cells, or to endow them with the functions of life. In other words, in the present and observed order of the universe, the forces of nature never break through or bridge over the barrier which separates the living from the lifeless; and seem, so far as we understand them, utterly incapable of doing so. But indisputably this barrier has been broken through. And the presence of life now in what was once a lifeless world reveals unmistakably the operation of a Power infinitely greater than the forces observed in nature. It thus confirms the strong presumption already derived from the beauty and the adaptation of the material world.

The same presumption is further confirmed by the phenomena of MIND. For human intelligence, (and even that of animals,) so vastly superior to its material surroundings, cannot possibly be explained by the operation of the unconscious forces of nature. It bears witness to the intelligence of its source.

Not only are natural forces unable to explain the origin of life and of intelligence, but they cannot explain THEIR OWN ORIGIN. Take, for instance, Gravitation, the simplest and best understood of these forces. Although its operation is so uniform and so well known, none can tell us why a stone falls to the ground, and why it falls sixteen feet in the first second. These are questions which elude utterly all scientific research. As we pursue them, they retire into the Unseen, and thus point to their origin. Natural Science does but tabulate phenomena in their co-existence and sequence. It does nothing whatever to trace them to their ultimate source. To do this, is the task of Theology. It thus enters and pursues a path opened for it by man's observation of nature and by the more careful researches of Natural Science, and seeks a goal to which Natural Science can never lead.

Nor can natural forces explain the ORIGIN OF MOTION. For the forces inherent in matter, such as gravitation and chemical affinity, tend always towards equilibrium and rest. The various movements in the world to-day reveal some primal impulse acting in a direction different from that of the inherent forces. That first impulse, whether or not it was simultaneous with the creation of matter, marks off what may be called the first moment of time. It cannot be accounted for by any of the known forces of the universe around us. Therefore, like the universe itself with its inherent forces, and like the origin of life, it reveals the operation of a higher Power.

Our study of the material world leads us one step further. All observation assures us that the various natural forces are closely related. Indeed their harmony suggests that they are but various forms of some one mysterious force. From the manifest unity of nature we infer with confidence that its SOURCE is ONE. And that Source must be higher and better than the highest derived from it.

Another phenomenon demands attention. While we contemplate the beauty of the universe and study the wonderful adaptation of its parts, their exhaustless variety, and their profound unity, the eye which contemplates gains immensely in clearness and penetration and width of view. The visible world is a great lesson book spread out before us. And the lessons it teaches DEVELOP THE INTELLIGENCE that learns them, and thus give to human life ever-increasing pleasure and worth. So wonderful and important is this development that it cannot be accidental. The value of the lesson reveals the presence of a Teacher infinitely wise. Man's own thoughts about nature suggest irresistibly that nature itself is a realisation of still higher thought. In other words, the effect of nature on man's intelligence proves, in agreement with our previous inference, that the Author of nature is Himself intelligent.

It is now evident that the visible universe is not complete in itself, but is only a PART OF A LARGER WHOLE. For it fails utterly to account for itself; and thus points to a source other than itself. This Source must be in every respect superior to everything derived

from it. And if superior to man, it must be Itself intelligent. For the intelligent is essentially higher than the unintelligent. In Lect. III. we shall find that another element distinguishing man from the lower animals, viz., the Moral Sense, has its source in God. And, being intelligent and moral, we may correctly speak of God as a PERSON. For, by so doing, we mean only that the intelligence and moral sense of man have a higher counterpart in God.

That the universe was created by an intelligent Power, was recognised by all the more cultured NATIONS OF ANTIQUITY. Of this I shall give two examples.

On p. 28 of the *Timaeus* of PLATO we read: "Was the heaven then and the world . . . always in existence and without beginning? or created and having a beginning? Created, I reply, being visible and tangible and having a body, and therefore perceived by the senses; and all sensible things which are apprehended by opinion and sense manifestly come into being and are begotten. Now that which is made must of necessity be made by a cause. But how can we find out the maker and father of all this universe? And, when we have found him, to speak of his nature to all men is impossible. Yet one more question has to be asked about him, Which of the patterns had the artificer in view when he made the world, the pattern which is unchangeable or that which is made? If the world be indeed fair and the artificer good, then as is plain he must have looked to that which is eternal. But if

what cannot be said without blasphemy is true, then he looked to the created pattern. Every one will see that he must have looked to the eternal, for the world is the fairest of the things which have begun to be and he is the best of causes."

Again on pp. 29, 30: "Let me tell you then why the creator created and made the universe. He was good, and no goodness can ever have any jealousy of anything. And, being free from jealousy, he desired that all things should be as like himself as possible. This is the true beginning of creation and of the world, as we shall do well in believing on the testimony of wise men: God desired that all things should be good and nothing bad in so far as this could be accomplished. Wherefore also finding the whole visible sphere not at rest, but moving in an irregular and disorderly manner, out of disorder he brought order, considering that this was far better than the other. Now the deeds of him who is the best can never be or have been other than the fairest; and the creator, reflecting upon the visible work of nature, found that no unintelligent creature taken as a whole was fairer than the intelligent taken as a whole; and that intelligence could not exist in anything which was devoid of soul (*i.e.* of life). For these reasons he put intelligence in soul, and soul in body, and framed the universe to be the best and fairest work in the order of nature. And therefore, using the language of probability, we may say that the world became a living soul and truly rational through the providence of God."

At the beginning of bk. ii. of CICERO's *Nature of the Gods* we read: "What can be so plain and evident, when we behold the heavens and contemplate the celestial bodies, as the existence of some supreme, divine intelligence, by which all these things are governed? Were it otherwise, Ennius would not, with universal approbation, have said,

> 'Look up to the refulgent heaven above,
> Which all men call unanimously Jove.'

This is Jupiter, the governor of the world, who rules all things with his nod, and is, as the same Ennius says, 'Of gods and men the sire,' an omnipresent and omnipotent God. And if any one doubts this, I really do not understand why the same man may not also doubt whether there is a sun or not. For what can possibly be more evident than this? And if it were not a truth universally impressed on the minds of men, the belief in it would never have been so firm; nor would it have been, as it is, increased by length of years, nor would it have gathered strength and stability through every age. And in truth we see that other opinions, being false and groundless, have already fallen into oblivion by lapse of time. Who now believes in Hippocentaurs and Chimeras? Or what old woman is now to be found so weak and ignorant as to stand in fear of those infernal monsters which once so terrified mankind? For time destroys the fictions of error and opinion, while it confirms the determinations of nature and of truth. And therefore it is that, both among us and among other nations, sacred institutions and the divine worship of the gods

have been strengthened and improved from time to time."

In section 6 of the same, Chrysippus the Stoic is quoted as saying: "If there is anything in the universe which no human reason, ability, or power can make, the being who produced it must certainly be preferable to man. Now celestial bodies, and all those things which proceed in any eternal order, cannot be made by man. The being who made them is therefore preferable to man. What then is that being but God? If there be then no such thing as a Deity, what is there better than man, since he only is possessed of reason, the most excellent of all things? But it is a foolish piece of vanity in man to think that there is nothing preferable to him: there is therefore something preferable: consequently, there is certainly a God."

These quotations are complete proof of the widespread belief, before the time of Christ and far from the nation which worshipped the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, that the world is neither self-existent nor a product of blind force but is the work of an intelligent and eternal Creator.

This widespread belief, however, is no essential part of my argument. But inasmuch as widespread and persistent beliefs almost always contain, even when in part erroneous, important elements of truth which enable them to survive the overthrow of other beliefs, this almost unanimous belief deserves careful attention. It confirms very strongly our own inference, expounded above, from our contemplation of the material world. For it proves

that this inference has been shared, in all ages and nations, by the most thoughtful of mankind.

We have now found a very strong presumption amounting almost to complete proof that beyond and above the visible universe is an invisible and intelligent Creator and Ruler. But this result already gained prompts questions more serious than those which it answers. We ask, Is He moral and merciful as well as intelligent? And does He care for us whom He has made? We know that soon the irresistible forces of nature will bring us to the grave. And we ask with trembling lips, Is there a life beyond the death which soon will claim us? To these questions the material world has no reply. For an answer we must look in another direction.

LECTURE III.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE VISIBLE WORLD IS CONFIRMED BY THE MORAL SENSE OF MAN.

OTHER matters of fact differing widely from those just mentioned as observed in the outward and visible world, matters attested, as absolutely certain, by man's direct observation of his own inner life, must now be considered.

We frequently find ourselves PRONOUNCING SENTENCE on the conduct and character of our fellows. And the judgments thus pronounced differ absolutely from all others. This difference is illustrated by the different emotions evoked in us by a great calamity and a great crime. An attempt to compare these last reveals at once their utter dissimilarity. The one we deplore: the other we condemn. And the condemnation thus pronounced and our approval of noble actions occupy a place of unique superiority to all other judgments pronounced by men.

These judgments and the moral principles which underlie them are only to a small extent under OUR OWN CONTROL. For we cannot change them at will; but are compelled, like judges in our courts of law, to pronounce

sentence according to principles already laid down. Our own condemnation or approval, we feel to be the voice of an authority infinitely higher than ourselves.

In its main outlines this authoritative standard is the same in all ages and all nations. On many details of conduct judgments differ. But the same types of character elicit everywhere and always the same admiration and the same condemnation. Whatever guilty ones may say in palliation of their crimes, all men everywhere know that treachery, lying, theft, adultery, dishonour to parents, and murder are condemned by a law which speaks with an unerring voice of indisputable authority. Of this agreement, the literature of the ancient world, from which some quotations are given below, affords abundant proof.

We notice also that frequently these judgments are pronounced with a certainty which tolerates no appeal. In spite of many mistakes in a multitude of cases which lie between the extremes of praise and blame, we pronounce at once, in all extreme cases, what we know to be a just judgment.

We now ask, What is this supreme and universal authority? Whence comes this standard of judgment so far beyond our control, and so decisive? Not from HUMAN LEGISLATION. For there has been no such universal legislation. And even a nation's laws must be judged at the bar of man's moral sense. Not everything that is legal is right. All legislators know that their laws must conform to a higher standard, that they need confirmation by a Judge who sits enthroned in every

man's own heart. So far are we from accepting as decisive the authority of human laws that sometimes we give highest praise to one who has set them at naught in obedience to a loftier authority. Evidently our sense of right and wrong is no mere transcript of human legislation. We must seek for it another source.

Nor can the Moral Sense be explained by man's OBSERVATION of the good and bad CONSEQUENCES of certain lines of action. Doubtless these observed consequences strengthen our own moral judgments. But the majesty of the moral sense and the authority of the sentence we pronounce on sin, frequently without thought of its results, prove conclusively that these observed consequences are not the only source and ground of our judgments. Otherwise there would be no reason why we should not sin, provided we can escape punishment. Yet every one of us would utterly condemn and despise a man who accepted this as his principle of action. A principle of conduct which we dare not avow and which we should condemn in others cannot be right. Yet it is a legitimate and necessary inference from the explanation before us. And the inference proves that the explanation which involves it is incorrect. The unique majesty and the absolute authority of the moral sense cannot be explained by man's observation of consequences.

It is no reply to say that observation teaches that all sin inevitably injures the sinner, and that the moral sense is an offspring of this observation. For, this observed sequence itself needs explanation. It cannot

be explained by any of the known forces of the material world, and therefore reveals the existence of a Power higher than they.

Thus fail utterly all attempts to explain, by the facts of the material world, the facts of the moral sense. Yet these latter facts come daily under our immediate observation, and are as certain as are those of the material world, and much more important. The standard which determines our judgments about our fellows and ourselves and the authority which maintains it elude the grasp of the students of Natural Science and of the social life of men. But no theory of the universe is worthy of a moment's attention which fails to give some account of this unique authority which colours the entire life and thought of man. And, since no explanation of it can be found in the material world, we must seek for one in the realm of the Unseen.

We have now found, by direct observation or sure inference, three groups of phenomena which cannot be explained by anything which lies within the immediate observation of man: viz. (1) the MATERIAL WORLD itself with the various forces inherent in matter or operating on matter, (2) the ORIGIN OF LIFE attested by sure inference from observed facts, (3) the MORAL JUDGMENTS of men. Each of these reveals the existence of a Power vastly superior to the natural forces we see operating around us. And these phenomena are most closely related. The material world is the arena of vegetable and animal life and of the intellectual and moral life of men. And only as stages

leading up to this higher life have the lower forms of life and the material world real worth. This close connection affords a presumption almost equal to certainty that these three unexplained phenomena have one invisible Source.

Already we have seen that the unreasoning material world evokes and develops the intelligence of man; and from this we inferred that the Author of the material world must Himself be intelligent. It is now equally evident that, to those who accept the rule of that in them which they know to be most worthy to rule, man's daily conflict with nature, caused in great part by his environment and by the necessities of bodily life, not only quickens his intelligence but gives scope for, and DEVELOPS, the highest MORAL QUALITIES, and thus gives to human life a nobility it could not otherwise have. Taking the race as a whole, the benefit of this discipline far outweighs the degrading tendency of the burdens of life. And it bears witness to the moral purpose of the Author of the universe.

This evidence is found only in the inner moral life and experience of men; and is not appreciated by all. But to thousands in all ages the felt moral helpfulness of man's material surroundings and the moral uses of even the hardships of life, known by direct introspection, have been decisive proof that the material world is the work of Him whose voice of authority they have heard in their own moral sense.

In another way also does man's constitution and

environment make for righteousness. Man is so constituted in mind and body and so placed that in the main and in the long run right and wrong doing bring respectively happiness and misery. This has been observed in all ages. So manifest is it, that to these observed sequences has been attributed the origin of the moral sense. That this explanation is insufficient, we have already seen. But, that the material constitution of the world in which we live brings good to those who obey the dictates of the moral sense, is additional proof that the moral sense and the material universe have one source and that that SOURCE is both INTELLIGENT and MORAL.

Thus the material universe around us and the inner life of man with one voice bear witness to the existence of One Greater in every way than the universe and man. The forces observed in inorganic matter, which was once the only form of matter, cannot explain the origin of matter, or the primal impulse which produced motion, or the origin of life, or the unique majesty of the moral sense. The analogy of man's best works affords a strong presumption that the universe has an intelligent source, and this is confirmed by the influence exerted by nature upon the intelligence of man. Moreover, the close connection between man's material and social environment and his moral life, and the moral helpfulness of his environment, compel us to believe that the Author of the universe is also its Moral Governor.

These results of our own observation receive remarkable confirmation from the literature of the ancient world. This affords abundant evidence that the broad principles of morality which determine our judgments to-day underlay the entire thought of the nations of antiquity; and that by them the moral sense of man was regarded as the voice of a superhuman Power claiming to direct and control the action of men. Of this testimony I shall give examples.

SOPHOCLES, in his drama of *Oedipus the King*, lines 863-71, represents a chorus of Theban old men as bursting into song, in reply to the queen who had derided a prophecy of Apollo, with these words, "May destiny still find me winning the praise of reverent purity in all words and deeds sanctioned by those laws of range sublime, called into life throughout the high clear heaven, whose father is Olympus alone; their parent was no race of mortal men, no, nor shall oblivion ever lay them to sleep; the god is mighty in them, and he grows not old."

The same writer, in his *Antigoné*, lines 449-60, represents the king of Thebes as saying, "And didst thou dare to transgress that law?" and Antigoné as replying, "Yes; for it was not Zeus that had published me that edict; not such are the laws set among men by the Justice who dwells with the gods below (*i.e.* ruling the dead); nor deemed I that the decrees were of such force that a mortal could override the unwritten and unfailing statutes of heaven. For their life is not of to-day or yesterday, but from all time, and no man

knows when they were first put forth. Not through dread of any human pride could I answer (*i.e.* pay penalty) to the gods for breaking these."

XENOPHON, in his *Memoirs of Socrates*, bk. iv. 4. 19-21, records a conversation with Hippias to the following effect: "Dost thou know, said he, Hippias, any unwritten laws? Those in every country, said he, held binding touching the same things. Wouldst thou then be able to say, said he, that men made them? Why how, said he, could all men come together when they do not speak the same language? Then who do you suppose, said he, has made these laws? I think, said he, that gods gave these laws to men. For with all men it is thought right first of all to reverence gods. Is it then everywhere thought right to honour parents? It is, said he. Also that parents and children do not marry? To me, Socrates, this does not seem to be a law of God. Why? said he. Because I see some, said he, transgressing it. Yes, and many other things they do against law. But then they who transgress the laws made by the gods pay a penalty which in no way man can escape; just as some who transgress laws made by men escape punishment secretly or by violence."

DEMOSTHENES, in his oration *On the Crown*, p. 317, says: "And not only will these principles be found in the enactments of the law, but even nature herself has laid them down in her unwritten laws and in the moral constitutions of men."

Similar evidence comes to us from ancient Rome. In CICERO'S *Laws*, bk. ii. 4, we read: "This, then, as it

appears to me, has been the decision of the wisest philosophers, that law was neither a thing contrived by the genius of man, nor established by any decree of the people, but a certain eternal principle which governs the entire universe, wisely commanding what is right and forbidding what is wrong. Therefore they called that primal and supreme law the mind of God enjoining or forbidding each separate thing in accordance with reason. On which account it is that this law, which the gods have bestowed on the human race, is so justly praised. For it is the reason and mind of a wise Being equally able to urge us to good and to deter us from evil. . . . For even he (Tarquin) had the light of reason deduced from the nature of things, which incites to good actions and dissuades from evil ones; and which does not begin for the first time to be a law when it is drawn up in writing, but from the first moment that it exists: and its existence is coeval with the divine mind. Therefore the true and supreme law, whose commands and prohibitions are equally authoritative, is the right reason of the Sovereign Jupiter."

The above quotations bear witness to a widespread belief that the principles of morality which underlie human laws are universal and of superhuman origin; and that they are the voice of an authority against which there is no appeal.

And they are confirmed by the entire literature of the ancient world. Thus our own inference from observation of our own inner life is supported by the testimony of the most thoughtful men of all ages and nations.

LECTURE IV.

EVIDENCE OF RETRIBUTION BEYOND THE GRAVE.

TO the results noted above, we must now add others similar.

We observe in our own hearts that disobedience to the dictates of the Moral Sense is always followed by moral deterioration, by loss of moral strength, and consequently by loss of self-respect. This immediate result of wrong doing awakens in us an irresistible apprehension that further evil results will follow. We cannot shake off a conviction that exact RETRIBUTION awaits every man. The irresistible majesty of the Moral Law, which secures at once the reverence of whatever in us is noblest and best, compels us to believe that it is able to vindicate its commands by due punishment and reward; that sin and sorrow, righteousness and well-being, are linked together by ties which none can break.

This expectation of reward and punishment is strengthened by our observation of various OUTWARD CONSEQUENCES which in the present life usually follow right and wrong doing. The immediate inward degradation noted above finds its outward counterpart in the bad effects of sin on society around us, effects which often

fall, sometimes with crushing force, by the outworking of influences which none can hinder, upon the head of the sinner. And this outward retribution is approved, and indeed demanded, by the Moral Sense. Where it is, we feel that moral order is maintained : where it is not, that order seems to be disturbed.

We notice however that in the present life retribution is IRREGULAR ; that, although the moral sense demands in every case due reward and punishment, very frequently the wicked prosper, and that not unfrequently good men have lost even life itself by doing right. The irregularity of retribution in the present life has in all ages puzzled the wisest of men. And in all ages the same explanation of it has been given, viz., that the present life is not the whole of man's existence, and that BEYOND THE GRAVE exact retribution awaits every one. This explanation is the only one which the felt majesty of the Moral Law permits us to entertain. It forbids us to believe even for a moment that any one can, in the long run, be a loser by doing right. Consequently, since some men have, by losing life, lost all earthly good through uprightness, there must be a life beyond the grave in which they will receive due recompense. Otherwise the Moral Law will be their debtor with a debt it can never pay : which is inconceivable. Thus in all ages the death of the righteous has revealed to men a hope beyond the grave.

To this widespread apprehension that punishment will inevitably follow sin and that retribution beyond the grave awaits all men, the entire literature of the world bears witness. In XENOPHON'S *Anabasis*, bk. ii. 5. 7, 8

a Greek commander says to a Persian general, evidently appealing to broad principles recognised by all men, "First and chiefly, the oaths of the gods forbid us to be hostile one to the other. And whoever is conscious of having disregarded these, that man I should never esteem happy. For I know not with what kind of speed and whither fleeing one would escape the hostility of the gods. For all things everywhere are subject to the gods, and everywhere equally they are masters of all things." Notice here the superhuman source of this inevitable sequence of sin and punishment.

Still more definite teaching is found in PLATO'S *Republic*, bk. x. pp. 612-14. "The nature both of just and unjust is truly known to the gods? Granted. And if they are both known to them, one must be the friend and the other the enemy of the gods, as we admitted at first? True. And the friend of the gods may be supposed to receive from them every good, except only such evil as is the necessary consequence of former sins? Certainly. This then must be our notion of the just man, that even when he is in poverty, or any seeming misfortune, all things will in the end work together for good to him in life and death: for the gods have a care of any one whose desire is to become just and to be like God, as far as man can attain the divine likeness, by the pursuit of virtue? Yes, he said; if he is like God he will surely not be neglected by him. . . . These then are the prizes and rewards and gifts which are bestowed upon the just by gods and men in this present life, in addition to other good things which justice of herself provides. Yes, he

said ; and they are fair and lasting. And yet, I said, all these things are as nothing either in number or greatness in comparison with those other recompenses which await both just and unjust after death." He then tells a story of judgment beyond death in which all men receive tenfold good or bad in proportion to their actions on earth.

Absolute retribution, beginning in this life and continuing beyond the grave, underlies the entire religious thought of India, ancient and modern. The *Dhammapada*, a famous work of the Buddhist canon, begins : " All that we are is the result of what we have thought : it is founded on our thoughts, it is made up of our thoughts. If a man speaks or acts with an evil thought, pain follows him, as the wheel follows the foot of the ox that draws the carriage. . . . If a man speaks or acts with a pure thought, happiness follows him like a shadow that never leaves him. . . . The evil-doer suffers in this world, and he suffers in the next ; he suffers in both. He suffers when he thinks of the evil he has done ; he suffers more when going on the evil path. The virtuous man is happy in this world, and he is happy in the next."

So strong is the conviction, in Indian thought, that sin and sorrow are linked together by an indissoluble tie that, in order to explain suffering inherited by birth or not merited in the present life by the sufferer, the Hindu has invented a previous existence which has left no trace in the memory of man. This strange belief, held to-day by millions in India and China, bears strong witness to man's deep sense of the moral inequalities of the present

life and of the inevitable retribution awaiting all men either on earth or beyond the grave.

We now see that, just as the material world cannot explain its own origin, or the origin of motion and of life, or the moral sense of man, and thus bears witness to the existence of a Power other and higher than the forces observed in operation in the visible world, so the present life by its incomplete retribution bears witness to an existence beyond the limits of human observation. In other words, in the visible world and the moral sense of men we see footprints of an invisible and intelligent Creator and Ruler and in the present life indications of a life to come. We have also found proof that these indications have been recognised and accepted in all ages and nations.

So important are these inferences and so vast is their influence on the higher life of man, that we must attribute them, not simply to man's intelligence, but to the Creator's DELIBERATE PURPOSE. In other words, if the universe and man be the work of an intelligent Creator, we must believe that He created them such as they are in order through His works to make Himself and His will known to His intelligent creatures. In this sense we have, in the material world and in the moral sense and the social life of men, a direct revelation of God to man. This unveiling of the unseen, which we have found to be common to the race generally, may be called the UNIVERSAL REVELATION. It finds embodiment more or less accurate and full in the various religions of the world; and underlies the

entire religious life of man. And it will form the basis of our further theological research.

The above quotations reveal the immense theological value of the extant literature of the ancient world. In it we see laid open to our inspection the thought and life of men in various and independent nations long before the time of Christ. And in that human thought we see reflected a superhuman Thought and Will.

The results just noted are of the highest importance. For we cannot doubt that, inasmuch as the first production of matter and motion and life is a much greater work than their maintenance, so their Unseen Source is greater than the forces observed now in the material world; and that the conscious existence beyond the grave in which the retribution begun on earth will receive its consummation is of vastly greater moment than the present life. We are therefore eager to know all we can about this greater Power and this life to come.

Other facts inward and outward increase this eagerness. All of us are marching to the grave: and we are reluctant to leave the brightness and the pleasures of the world around us. Moreover, most or all of us are conscious of PERSONAL SIN. And our deep sense of the inevitable and proportionate sequence of action and retribution awakes in us, in view of the imperfect retribution of the present life, as we approach the dark river of death, a fear that beyond it we shall meet the CONSEQUENCES of our past misdeeds. On the

other hand, we are sure that beyond that silent shore blessing awaits the righteous. Thus the indications of existence after death create in man a new need, viz. of deliverance from the future penalty of past sins. We seek forgiveness in order that we may enter the future rest of the righteous.

We soon become conscious of another need. Our fear of punishment prompts efforts to do right, that thus by future obedience we may atone for past neglect. Whether the future can thus atone for the past, is very doubtful. But it is all that remains under our control. Sad to say, these efforts, in proportion to their earnestness, do but reveal our MORAL powerlessness and BONDAGE. We find our past sins to be a present power forcing us along our former evil path. This bondage, once felt, becomes an intolerable degradation. And it strengthens our apprehension of further punishment to come. In other words, our preliminary investigations have aroused in us a sense of double need, viz. of pardon for the past and of moral liberation from present bondage.

The help we need, we CANNOT FIND in the material world, or from our fellows, or in the Moral Law. Loud voices speak of retribution, none of pardon. Nature tells us of invariable sequence, but suggests nothing which will break the observed sequence of past sin and present bondage and future punishment. The Moral Law marks out the right path, but does nothing to help those who find themselves unable to go along it. If help is to be found, it must be from sources

other than these. But, inasmuch as whatever is true is in harmony with whatever else is true, the help we seek must be in harmony with the facts already observed and noted. For such deliverance from the penalty of past sins and from present moral bondage, a deliverance which shall pay homage to the supreme majesty of the Moral Law, we now seek. This deliverance, so needful to our highest well-being, is the practical aim of theology. We seek to know all we can about the Unseen, so far as it makes for righteousness, with a hope that in the Unseen we may find the deliverance which we have vainly sought among the things that are seen. Whatever helps us in this search belongs to the Science of Theology.

LECTURE V.

CHRISTIANITY AND CHRIST.

THESE thoughts about the Unseen remind us, and the literature of all nations proves abundantly, that in all ages multitudes of others besides ourselves have had similar thoughts. Their thoughts have assumed definite form in the various RELIGIONS of the world. And they have found visible expression in temples everywhere erected and sacrifices offered to supposed persons whom no living man has seen and whose voice none has heard. The costliness of these temples and sacrifices reveals the worshippers' firm belief, in agreement with our own inference already noted, that beyond and above the world seen around us is a greater world unseen. Not unfrequently, in order to gain the blessings of that unseen world, men have gladly given up all earthly good and even life itself. And, in a vast number of cases, this strong conviction of the reality of the Unseen has indisputably been a strong upward moral force. It has made for righteousness. This wonderful phenomenon, viz. Religion in its various forms, demands now our careful study.

We notice in passing that these various visible manifestations of faith in the Unseen are a distinguishing feature of MAN as compared with the lower ANIMALS. Of these last, the entire visible activity is explained by the needs and pleasures of bodily life. The bee gathers honey and makes cells, and birds build their nests: but these are needful for their bodily well-being. They erect neither temples nor altars. On the other hand, in all nations, except perhaps some of the very lowest, we have both sanctuaries and worship. And these reveal man's consciousness of things greater and better than the visible objects around him.

The religions of men present, at first sight, a bewildering VARIETY. But closer inspection reveals many elements common to all. In spite of an admixture in many cases of elements immoral in their tendency, all religions pay honour to the supreme majesty of the Moral Law, and assert Moral Retribution. With scarcely an exception, they point to retribution beyond the grave. And almost all religions bid men to bow before an unseen Creator and Father and Ruler of all men.

Among all the various religions of the world, one religion occupies a place of UNIQUE SUPERIORITY. Christian nations hold, and for a thousand years have held, with few exceptions, a practical monopoly of sustained progress and of all higher forms of good. Every non-Christian nation is, and for long centuries has been, unless elevated by the influence of Christian

nations, sinking into decay. But, with scarcely an exception, every Christian nation bears marks of PROGRESS, material, intellectual, and moral.

The Christian nations form, in spite of their many wars, in a very real sense a POLITICAL brotherhood. The rights of the weakest are respected; and the power of the strongest is limited. Of that brotherhood, through sheer incapacity, no non-Christian nation is a member. No Christian nation treats, or can treat, with Turkey or Persia or China, as on equal terms. No Christian nation would tolerate the interference with its internal administration to which again and again Turkey has submitted. Nor would any Christian nation try to impose on another such interference. Even the vast population of China, equal probably to that of the six great powers of Europe combined, does not make that empire equal in political influence to any one of these. In internal administration we notice a similar inferiority. Outside the Christian nations and Christian influence, constitutional government, or even government for the good of the governed, is unknown. As compared with Christian nations, in spite of their many corruptions, the non-Christian nations stand on a definitely lower level.

Still more conspicuous is the difference in MILITARY power. No army has now the slightest hope of victory unless armed with the weapons and directed by the strategy of Christian nations. Even the sword has passed into the hands of the nations which recognise the unique majesty of the lowly Nazarene

Military power must be counted, even by lovers of peace, an element of material good. For it guards our homes, makes impossible the overthrow of civilisation by barbarism, and gives a security unknown in earlier days.

The wonderful progress in NATURAL SCIENCE which has been so marked a feature of the present century has been confined to the Christian nations. In this direction, the non-Christian nations, so far from marching in the front, can scarcely follow; as witness, the state of medicine in China and Persia. ART bears the same evidence. Non-Christian nations add nothing of equal merit to our galleries of sculpture and painting, or to the world's treasury of music. Nor do they now contribute anything to the higher forms of LITERATURE. In short, of every form of culture as of every kind of power, a practical monopoly is held by the Christian nations.*

This monopoly becomes the more remarkable when we remember that art, science, and culture, and political and military power, did not owe their origin to Christianity, but attained considerable development long before Christ was born and far from the nation which was waiting for His coming. The military skill of Alexander, of Hannibal, and of Cæsar is recognised by all modern soldiers. Roman Law is still studied with respect in our Universities. The artists of our

* A terrible description of the immense inferiority of Persia to the nations of Europe, by the late Persian ambassador to England, is given in the *Contemporary Review* for February 1891.

day draw inspiration still from the art of ancient Greece. In the same gifted race, or in earlier races, science had its beginning. And in literature, the masterpieces of ancient Greece still hold their place of highest honour.

But when Christ was born, the culture of Greece had long passed its prime, and the power of Rome bore already seeds of decay. Within three centuries of His death, the greatest ruler in the world thought fit to acknowledge the supreme royalty of Christ. The barbarian invaders who threatened to destroy the civilisation of the ancient world accepted the religion, and with it the civilisation, of the empire they trampled under foot. Imperceptibly and silently, Christ has laid His hand upon every form of material good, and has given it to the nations which acknowledge His sway.

The SUSTAINED PROGRESS of modern Christian nations presents a marked contrast to the history of the ancient world. The ancient empires, mighty as they were, had little permanence, or at least permanent progress. The splendid empire of Nebuchadnezzar rose, culminated, and fell, within the lifetime of the prophet Daniel. The military prowess, the art and literature, of Greece began to fade almost as soon as they had reached their bloom. The solid empire of Rome was erected on the crushed liberties of the Roman people; and soon gave evidence of the corruption which eventually destroyed it. But for a thousand years the history of the Christian nations has been a

history of progress. There have been times of apparent retrogression. But it has been only the momentary retreat of the incoming tide. Some Christian nations have lagged behind others. But it has been the joy of this generation to witness the advance of even the most backward.

Far more important than the material progress just mentioned is the growth, in the Christian nations, of the SENSE OF RIGHT, of mutual KINDNESS, of COMPASSION for the helpless, and of all that makes up the higher life of man. When Christ was born, the world was sinking hopelessly, in spite of considerable culture, into deep and deeper moral corruption. And to-day, everywhere outside the Christian nations and Christian influences, there is still moral stagnation and corruption. But in all Christian nations we see, in spite of many blemishes, real moral progress, apparent in the habits of society, in a purer and stronger public opinion, and in more earnest effort to help the weak and the unfortunate.

This monopoly of sustained progress by the professedly Christian nations is the most CONSPICUOUS FEATURE OF human life and HISTORY. Before Christ came, there was general progress; scattered over many widely separated nations. But it was fitful; and its forms were transient. In His day, its force seemed to be spent; and apparently universal and hopeless decay had set in. But now a new element comes silently on the scene. Amid the ruins of the ancient civilisation a new civilisation, a new morality, and a new hope

begin to develop. A new progress, slow but sure, is soon detected. The progress is maintained. It extends to every department of human life. Out of the chaos of the ancient world rises the solid structure of modern society. And, strangest of all, this wonderful progress in everything that pertains to human welfare is found only in those nations which recognise the supreme authority of an obscure and apparently untrained Teacher who was laid in the grave before He had reached the prime of life. It is scarcely too much to say that to-day every Christian nation is rising in material and moral good; and certainly no non-Christian nation is rising mentally or morally except by contact with Christian nations. This remarkable phenomenon demands explanation.

It is right to admit that in all Christian countries thousands DISOBEY the commands of Christ, that many NEGLECT utterly all religious ordinances, and that some DENY even the existence of God. But this by no mean proves that they are not benefited by the Christianity they neglect or reject. For we are often greatly, though unconsciously, affected by influences which we resolutely resist. In Christian countries Christian influences are everywhere and always operating. The mass of the people recognise Jesus of Nazareth as incomparably the greatest Teacher the world has ever known. His words are more or less familiar to them. To Him they turn in their better moments. And by His teaching, directly or indirectly, their moral sense is raised and strengthened. Moreover,

in all Christian countries the number of sincere servants of Christ is much larger than at first sight appears; and their influence for good permeates the entire community.

It is also right to admit that several conspicuous leaders of Natural Science reject the distinctive features of Christianity. But most or all of them pay homage to Christ as the greatest Moral Teacher of any age or nation. Moreover these anti-Christian teachers have been trained in a moral and intellectual atmosphere formed by many centuries of Christian influences. Outside of Christendom we find to-day and for many centuries past no progress even in Natural Science. The very recent date of this anti-Christian teaching forbids us to base an argument upon it. Time is needed to test its effect upon the highest interests of men. Certainly no inference drawn from a small fragment of the race during one or two generations can have any force against an induction based upon the present state of every nation in the world during the many centuries illumined by the light of history. Whether the moral influence of those who reject Christianity will benefit or injure our race, remains to be seen. As yet, such men have done very little directly to lessen human sorrow or to develop the higher side of human life.

The unique position of Christianity among the nations is not made less remarkable, although its influence for good is lessened, by the many DIVISIONS of the followers of Christ. For these divisions do but slightly

veil a wonderful underlying unity. ALL CHRISTIANS AGREE to assert that Jesus of Nazareth is incomparably the greatest moral Teacher that has ever lived. And, with exceptions too few to mention, they all agree in the remarkable belief that the Crucified One is the Eternal Son of God and the Creator of the universe; that in order to save men He became Man; that in order to remove a barrier between God and man caused by man's sin He willingly submitted to die; that He rose from the dead; and that He will return in splendour to raise the dead, to judge all men, and to set up an Eternal Kingdom. That these remarkable doctrines are held firmly and are greatly prized by almost all religious men in all the foremost nations of the world, and that these nations hold the position already described, are facts which urgently demand explanation.

Of the pre-eminence of the Christian nations NO EXPLANATION can be found EXCEPT their CHRISTIANITY. For this is the only element they have in common and in distinction from other nations. Their superiority cannot be attributed to race. For, as their languages prove, the Hindus and Persians are kinsmen of the European nations. But how vast the difference! The Hungarians and Turks belong to the same Turanian race. When they successively entered Europe there was little or nothing to choose between them. But the one takes rank to-day among the Christian nations: the other, in spite of far better geographical position, is, with few regrets, decaying and dying before our eyes. The growth of the Christian nations which

have thrown off the Turkish yoke is in marked contrast to the present condition of their former masters. The awakening of Japan has been caused by contact with Christian nations. And to these it is now turning for help along the newly-entered path of progress.

In our search for an explanation of the immense superiority of the Christian nations, for which as we have seen we can find no explanation except their Christianity, we turn now to the past HISTORY of our race; in order therein to trace the steps by which the unique religion mounted to its place of power.

Christianity arose suddenly out of an obscure nation and out of a national religion.

In the ancient world, the JEWISH RACE stands alone. Its Sacred Books never stoop to tolerate idolatry. They speak ever of One intelligent and merciful Creator and Ruler of the world; and reveal an actual intercourse with Him which is unique in ancient literature. Equally conspicuous is the joyful expectation, here and there expressed, of world-wide and glorious blessings to come. The same books contain an intelligible account of the beginning of the world; and a national history without parallel for its compass and completeness and for its spiritual significance. In its assured KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, the Jewish nation stood at the time of Christ, far above all others. And in our own day its ancient religious literature is of highest spiritual profit to the most godly, the most intelligent, and even to the least educated, of Christians.

Yet, in spite of this immense superiority, the religion

of the Jews had made LITTLE MARK ON the religious thought and life of the NATIONS AROUND. Doubtless in the minds of not a few the loftier conceptions of God embodied in the Jewish Scriptures and read in the synagogues of the Dispersion had prepared a way for the Gospel. But on the nations around the influence of the Jewish religion was not conspicuous. At the birth of Christ, the race itself, like all others, seemed to have passed its prime. National independence was irrevocably lost. The long line of prophets and teachers had ceased. In the sacred land disorder prevailed. Nothing remained to Israel in the widespread and deepening gloom except the hope of a coming Deliverer.

Suddenly, in consequence of the preaching of the followers of One whom the leaders of the Jewish nation had murdered, the waters of Shiloah, which for many centuries had trickled unobserved among the nations, burst their banks and overspread the world, carrying everywhere moral and spiritual fertility, where before there had been only barrenness and decay. In many a Gentile land to-day, wherever the name of Christ is honoured, the songs of Zion are sung. Wherever they are not sung by Christian lips, barrenness and decay continue.

This marvellous outburst of the rill of Judaism into the river of Christianity must be attributed to JESUS OF NAZARETH. For to Him points, as the source of all the blessings conferred by the Gospel, all Christian life and thought as embodied in literature and history. To all Christians, Christ is both the Source of all good

and the unique Pattern of all excellence. Indeed, in their view, loyalty to Him involves all excellence. Other religions have had personal founders. But none has been so completely dominated by one Personality. And, if Christianity be due to the personal influence of Christ, it is not too much to say that He has SAVED OUR RACE from the ruin into which in His day it was hopelessly sinking, and has turned back the course of human history into a new path of progress and prosperity. For, as we have seen, these are found only in the nations which bow to Christ.

The rise and the effects of Christianity are the more wonderful because apparently until within some three years of His death, which took place before He had reached His prime, its Founder was, according to the earliest Christian records, an unknown artisan in a country town of the outlying province of Galilee. During this short space of a young man's life was exerted an influence which has changed the entire current of human thought and the whole aspect of human life. We ask eagerly, Who and what was Jesus, and how came He to exert in so short a time so wonderful an influence on all succeeding ages? We cannot accept for a moment any theory of the universe which fails to explain the immense influence for good of Jesus of Nazareth, as attested to-day by the records of the past and by the present condition of the nations of the world. Our question is the more pressing because indisputably He spoke much about an Unseen Ruler of the world and about a life beyond the grave.

LECTURE VI.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCUMENTS.

THE immense influence of Jesus of Nazareth upon the religious thought of the world and indirectly upon its material well-being makes Him an object of supreme interest. For, as we have seen, we need a teacher who can lift the veil which hides from us the mysterious Source of the universe, of life, and of the moral sense of man, and can show us a way to pardon and to moral liberty. This, no other teacher offers to do. And no religious teacher can for a moment be compared with the Author of the great religious impulse which has moulded and ennobled whatever is best in human life. We therefore seek eagerly all available information about the Founder of Christianity.

Inasmuch as Christ is separated from us by long centuries, our only sources of information are WRITTEN DOCUMENTS. To these we now turn.

We have nothing from the pen of Christ. But we have THIRTEEN LETTERS claiming to have been written by PAUL, the most conspicuous of the early teachers of Christianity. All these were accepted, before the close of the second century, by writers in places so far apart

as Gaul, Egypt, and Carthage, without a shadow of doubt as genuine works of Paul. One of them, 1 Corinthians, is expressly quoted as his at the beginning of the second century in an extant letter from the Church at Rome to that at Corinth. This strong external testimony is supported by equally strong internal evidence. So complete is this proof that at least four of these Epistles, those to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians, have been in all ages accepted as genuine by all scholars, even by some who reject as erroneous the most conspicuous elements of the teaching of Paul. These last believe that the Apostle was in serious error touching his Master; but they cannot doubt that he wrote these letters. This proof, which leaves no room for doubt, I have expounded at length in my commentaries on these epistles. I have also in another volume shown strong reasons for believing that the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, may also be accepted with confidence as genuine.

It is equally certain that we have these Epistles in a form practically the same as that in which they left the writer's hand. This is placed beyond doubt by the great number and close AGREEMENT OF OUR COPIES. Some account of these copies and of the extent of their agreement and divergence, I have given in my commentaries. The whole subject is discussed in various works on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.

In this work, unless otherwise stated, I shall quote the New Testament only so far as its text is accepted with

confidence by all the best Critical Editors. Consequently, our results will not be affected by the various readings of the ancient copies.

The letters of Paul, thus preserved for us, are of immense value in our present research. For they take us into the actual presence of the great Apostle, and throw open to our inspection both his thoughts about Christ and his own intellectual and moral life. We are at once impressed with the writer's keen intelligence and well-balanced judgment, and with his high moral character. In him we have a witness who claims our respect and confidence. And from his letters we shall be able to reproduce with complete certainty the conception of Christ held by the ablest probably of His contemporary followers.

With the letters of Paul we can compare other very ancient documents evidently not written by him or under his influence, and therefore containing independent evidence. We have FOUR MEMOIRS professing to give an account of the life and death of Christ; and a NARRATIVE of the founding of the earliest Christian CHURCHES which a unanimous tradition, supported by many internal indications, has always attributed to the author of the Third Gospel. All these are anonymous, *i.e.* without author's name in the text. But by all early Christian writers the First and Fourth Gospels are attributed to Apostles and to the same two Apostles; and the Second and Third Gospels and the Book of Acts to known companions of Apostles. See especially Irenæus *Against Heresies* bk. iii. 8-11. This traditional

authorship is accepted with perfect confidence by all early Christian writers in all parts of the world from the second century onwards. Their agreement proves that the documents were then ancient. And that these four accounts of the life of Christ, and no others, were everywhere accepted as authoritative and in some sense official, and that without a trace of difference of opinion the same authors' names were always attached to them, reveals their unique position in early Christian literature. We have also in the New Testament other epistles and a remarkable prophetic work.

Each of these documents DIFFERS WIDELY, both in phraseology and in modes of thought, from the Epistles of Paul. Even in the Fourth Gospel, which in fundamental teaching approaches them most nearly, the marked features of Paul's thought, *e.g.* justification through faith, union with Christ in His death and resurrection, are altogether absent. And the First Gospel differs still more widely, not only from the writings of Paul, but both in phraseology and modes of thought from the Fourth Gospel. In other words, we have in the New Testament a chorus of independent witnesses about the teaching and the claims of Christ. This variety of witnesses is of utmost value. For it enables us to eliminate from the conception of Christ presented in the Epistles of Paul the peculiarly Pauline element; and thus to mount from the Gospel preached by Paul to the actual teaching of Christ. The remarkable agreement underlying wide differences in thought and expression will convince us that the element common

to the various writers of the New Testament and different from other earlier and contemporary teaching came from the lips of the Founder of Christianity. Thus the Christian documents will lead us into the presence of Christ.

Occupying a unique relation to the above, is another earlier collection of religious writings. In the OLD TESTAMENT we have a great variety of documents extending in their composition manifestly over many centuries, containing important statements of fact, and embodying a religious life profoundly significant as the dawn of the Gospel day. Most of them are quoted, some frequently, in the New Testament as a decisive authority in religion. They therefore belong to the facts of Christian Theology.

Of great value for comparison and contrast with the above are the many other Sacred Books of the ancient world.

The evidence at our disposal determines the CORRECT METHOD of theological research. We must first endeavour, by consecutive study of Paul's epistles, to trace their line of thought and to grasp the ideas they were intended to convey. While doing this we must group these ideas in their logical relation, in order thus to reproduce his conception of Christ and the Gospel. This we shall find to be most definite and systematic. This line of study will place us on the mental standpoint of one of the most conspicuous of the early followers of Christ.

The Gospel and First Epistle of John, which are

very closely related and are manifestly from the same pen, will next claim similar treatment. In them we shall find another conception of Christ and the Gospel. This we shall compare with the theology of Paul, and endeavour to reach the element common to both. There is evidence strong and to me decisive that these documents are from the pen of an intimate and beloved associate of Jesus. If so, the picture of Christ presented by them has authority equal to that presented in the Epistles of Paul. But this is not needful to, although it would greatly strengthen, the argument of this work. For indisputably in the Fourth Gospel we have an independent witness who, as we shall see, confirms wonderfully the teaching of Paul about Christ and the Gospel.

A third definite type of teaching, we shall find in the First Gospel and in the Epistle of James, documents closely related, not in their traditional origin but in their modes of thought. The remaining books of the New Testament will, so far as they are needful to my argument, be treated in the same way.

We shall compare occasionally the teaching of Christ with that of the earlier teachers of His own nation. Their language will frequently explain that of the New Testament. In the Old Testament we shall find germs of doctrines afterwards more fully expounded in the Gospel. And in many points a comparison and contrast of Old and New will be of the utmost value.

This method of research is thoroughly scientific and

philosophical. For it rests ultimately on matters of fact which have come under our own observation, and is in harmony with the principles of human certainty touching matters which have not come under our observation; and it uses ascertained facts as avenues of approach to broad principles. In its earlier stages it will be grammatical and historical. We shall try to understand the meaning of words proved, by strictly historical evidence, to have been written by Paul or by his contemporaries. We shall thus reproduce his actual thoughts about Christ and the Gospel. And, by comparing these with the writings of others, we shall endeavour to reach the actual teaching of Christ. We shall meet with important statements of fact; and these we shall test by historical evidence. The moral teaching of Christ will be at once judged at the bar of the Moral Sense, the Judge supreme who reigns in every heart. And in another volume the entire teaching of Christ will be tested by its effect on the heart and life of man.

This main outline of research requires the aid of several other departments of knowledge. Already I have mentioned Textual Criticism. Still more important is the grammar and lexicography of the language of the New Testament. For frequently important theological teaching is embodied in a grammatical inflection or in the meaning of a word. The same is true of the language of the Old Testament. All this involves a study of ancient languages and of the Science of Language. Our research will also

lay under contribution the Science of Thought, and occasionally the History of Nations. And, as we have already seen, even Geology and Chemistry contribute to this the highest department of human knowledge.

From the above will appear the position in theological research occupied by works such as the present. A knowledge of Theology, *i.e.* an intelligent conception of that great Unseen which makes for righteousness, can as little and as much be derived from modern theological works as can a knowledge of Botany from books on Botany. In each case, for a comprehensive grasp of the subject there must be personal contact with the facts on which the Science rests. For Theology, there must be patient consecutive study of the Christian documents, and careful observation of the material world, of the social life around us, and of the inner life of man. Indeed, whatever pertains to man will teach us, directly or indirectly, something about the great unseen Realities which underlie all human life. On the other hand, observed facts are of real use to us only so far as we interpret their significance as exponents of broad principles. Our success in this effort to read the meaning of that which our eyes see is the measure of our knowledge. And in our effort to do so we shall welcome eagerly the aid of other observers as embodied in theological works.

The line of research just marked out, I have already entered upon in my commentaries on the Epistles of

Paul. In these I have endeavoured to trace the line of thought of each epistle annotated, and have summed up at various points the practical and theological results of our consecutive study of them. Thus my earlier volumes lead up step by step to the present work.

LECTURE VII.

THE MORAL TEACHING OF CHRIST.

BEFORE proceeding to the most distinctive features of the teaching of the New Testament, certain other elements in it common to the Old Testament and in some measure to other ancient religious books claim our attention because of their direct bearing on the results attained in the foregoing chapters.

As His words are recorded in the Four Gospels, Christ spoke frequently and emphatically about a FATHER in heaven, the unseen CREATOR and RULER of man and of the universe; and this conception moulded and coloured all His teaching. He spoke also of God as taking deep interest in man and as coming near to him to save and to bless, and as an object of man's trust and affection and a source of hope and joy. The same ideas underlie the entire New Testament; and are a conspicuous feature of the Old Testament, especially as compared with other contemporary religious writings. In other words, our own sure inference from the facts of the material world and from the felt authority of the moral sense is strongly confirmed, and is brought to bear on human thought

and life, by the express teaching of the Author of the great religious impulse which has shaped for good the destinies of the world.

In the Old Testament God is constantly represented as giving, or as having given, to men definite COMMANDS; and as making obedience to these commands a condition of His favour. In this, the Jewish Scriptures are followed by Christ, by all the writers of the New Testament, and by many non-Christian religious teachers of all ages.

The Old Testament speaks occasionally, especially in its later books, of a perfect RETRIBUTION BEYOND THE GRAVE. This is conspicuously taught by Christ and throughout the New Testament. It underlies the strange doctrine of Transmigration common to Hinduism and Buddhism, these embracing a great part of the religious thought of Asia; and is nearly coextensive with the religious thought of mankind. Thus our own inference from the manifest imperfection of retribution on earth is confirmed by the teaching of Christ and by the remarkable agreement of the many religions of the world.

The discourses of Christ are full of moral teaching. He not only announces retribution beyond the grave, but tells His hearers what they must do and leave undone in order to escape punishment and obtain eternal life. Now, all moral teaching must be judged at the bar of the MORAL SENSE of man. For this is, as we have seen, the supreme judge of human conduct. We ask at once, What is the judgment pronounced on

the moral teaching of Christ by the judge enthroned in every heart?

The judgment is decisive. The entire moral teaching of Christ and of the New Testament commends itself to us as right and good and lofty. It does more than this. The teaching of Jesus enriches and elevates and strengthens our own moral sense, gives to us a loftier ideal of human excellence, and gives to this ideal absolute authority as henceforth the law of our life. In His presence, the judge enthroned within, the supreme arbiter to us of right and wrong, bows as in the presence of One greater than himself, and at His bidding mounts a still loftier throne. A Voice which thus raises and strengthens that in us which is loftiest and best reveals itself manifestly as that of our Lord and Master.

The details of this impression cannot be reproduced in exact statement. We notice however the dignified simplicity of moral teaching which, instead of small details, asserts broad principles capable of universal application. Morality is summed up as unreserved loyalty to God and to His Kingdom and as active good-will towards all men. And it claims as its domain the inward as well as the outward life of man.

It is worthy of note that some of the noblest words of Christ are quotations from the Old Testament. But, as quoted and combined by Him, their moral force is greatly increased. In the other literature of the ancient world we find not unfrequently high moral teaching.

Yet few will deny that, taken as a whole, the teaching of the New Testament rises immensely, as a practical guide in life, above that of every other moral teacher.

Nor is this all. In the picture of Christ presented in the New Testament we see a perfect EMBODIMENT IN REAL LIFE of this lofty moral ideal. Whatever we there read about human excellence is but a feature in the portrait of Jesus of Nazareth. We see a man whose one thought is to do and to complete the work for which God sent Him into the world and to enrich with highest blessing all who are willing to receive it; an object of unceasing and unscrupulous conspiracy, yet never uttering a word of resentment. We see, as the teaching of the New Testament will be expounded in PART IV., the Eternal Son of God laying aside the prerogatives of deity, taking upon Himself the limitations and the weakness of human life on earth, and surrendering Himself to a cruel death in order to save men, by a method in harmony with eternal justice, from the penalty of their sins, and to bring them into the glory of the kingdom of God. Compared with this costly manifestation of unreserved devotion to God and of infinite love to man, every other recorded act of obedience or of beneficence sinks into insignificance. In the life and death of Jesus, as these are depicted in the New Testament, we have, without defect and surpassing the thought of man, a perfect embodiment of the highest human excellence.

This recognition, by our own moral sense, of the absolute authority of the moral teaching and the

example of Christ renders important confirmation to His teaching about retribution beyond the grave and about our Father in heaven. For it is in the last degree unlikely that One whose moral teaching we dare not and cannot reject should be in serious error touching matters bearing so closely upon morals. Thus our own inferences from our observation of the material world and from the imperfect retribution in the present life are confirmed not only by the express teaching of Christ but also indirectly by the grandeur and authority of His moral teaching. And we have already seen that the teaching of Christ is confirmed by its effect upon the world and by the unique superiority of the Christian nations. Teaching thus doubly confirmed we may accept with confidence as true. It has been accepted in all ages and nations by nearly all the best of men.

It must be confessed that these results of our preliminary study, valuable as they are, do little directly to supply our deep spiritual need. As yet we have heard no voice of pardon, and have experienced no liberation from our moral bondage. Indeed the lofty teaching and example of Christ rather make us feel how far and how inexcusably we have fallen below the ideal to which we ought to have risen. And we shrink from the light which with increasing clearness reveals our own deep sin. Even the efforts after amendment prompted by this sense of guilt do little more than reveal our moral powerlessness. We lie condemned and helpless in the presence of the living Pattern which we find ourselves unable to imitate.

On the other hand, Christ spoke much about the goodness and mercy of God; and promised help to those who need it. "Come to Me," said He, "all ye that are weary and heavy-laden, and I will give you rest." And the matchless dignity of His moral teaching persuades us that what He promises He is able to do. We wait to see whether the mercy of God will provide for the guilty a way of pardon, and for the captives deliverance from bondage.

To sum up. We have found in nature visible footprints of an unseen and supernatural and personal Creator and Ruler. In the moral sense of man we seemed to hear His voice: and in the moral teaching of Christ we heard that voice still more distinctly. In human life around us we saw indications of retribution beyond death. The unique pre-eminence of the Christian nations and the remarkable rise and progress of Christianity arrested our attention and demanded explanation. A partial explanation we found in the sublime moral teaching of Christ. But this rather quickened than satisfied our eager inquiry. We seek further information about this great Teacher and about the wonderful religious impulse to which He gave birth. And we seek, what we have not yet found, a supply of our deep spiritual needs.

PART II.

JUSTIFICATION THROUGH FAITH.

LECTURE VIII.

THE FUNDAMENTAL GOSPEL OF PAUL.

IN our search for deliverance from the penalty of past sin and from present moral bondage we turn now to certain other elements in the teaching of Christ and of the New Testament quite distinct from, yet closely interwoven with and related to, the moral teaching just expounded, elements peculiar, in the religious thought of the world, to the teaching of Christ and His followers.

Having nothing from the pen of Christ, our safest avenue of approach to His actual teaching is to be found in the letters which we have traced by indisputable evidence to the pen of the most conspicuous of the early preachers of the Gospel. For these letters place us at once in the presence of an illustrious Christian contemporary of Christ. From them we shall endeavour to reproduce Paul's conception of the Gospel and of Christ.

In order that our reproduction may be rational, we must try to trace this conception as it shaped itself in the mind of Paul. Especially must we seek for the germ thoughts from which others grew. These we shall find in the facts and doctrines taken for granted by Paul as needing no proof and made by him a basis for further argument. These arguments and the practical applications to which they lead up, we must carefully trace. We shall thus come into actual contact with the living thought of Paul; we shall approach his mental standpoint, and from it look at the new teaching which in his day began to renovate the spiritual life of the world.

It is at once evident that this line of research requires consecutive study of the Epistles of Paul. Such consecutive study I have already attempted in my commentaries. The results there gained I must now assume: or rather the justification of many details in this work must be sought in my earlier volumes.

As a guide to the theology of Paul, the EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS claims the first place. For it does not, like the Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians, deal with matters peculiar to the readers; but gives, to men whom Paul had never seen, a systematic statement of the Gospel he was accustomed to preach. Having nothing specially to write about, he writes about that which is nearest to his own thought and heart. And he arranges his thoughts in logical order. As a systematic treatise, this letter reveals to us, better than does any other from his pen, as a whole and in the

process of development, the great Apostle's conception of the Master whom he served and of the salvation he everywhere proclaimed.

The first seven verses of the Epistle are a somewhat formal greeting. We notice however a very conspicuous mention of Christ as *Son of David* and *Son of God*; and a distinctive justification of this latter title, *marked out as Son of God by resurrection of the dead.* Then follow in *vv.* 8-15 personal details revealing Paul's continued and deep interest in his readers and his desire to visit them. He is debtor to all men alike, and is eager to discharge that debt to the citizens of Rome by preaching to them the Gospel.

This last word leads up in *v.* 16 to an important description of the Gospel: *It is a power of God for salvation to every one that believes, to Jew first and to Greek.* This statement is further explained in *v.* 17; and the explanation is supported by a quotation from the prophet Habakkuk: *For a righteousness of God is revealed in it, from faith, for faith; according as it is written, "But the righteous man by faith will live."*

In this description we notice at once the word *salvation*, the cognate words *righteousness* and *righteous*, and the cognates *believe* and *faith*, this last three times. This group of words we shall find to be all-important in the theology of Paul.

In *v.* 18, using the word *revealed* as a hinge, Paul turns suddenly round to new topics. The word *faith* or *believe*, so conspicuous in *vv.* 16, 17, meets us no more, except in a different sense in ch. iii. 3,

till in ch. iii. 21 it conspicuously and suddenly reappears associated again with the word *righteousness.* Manifestly ch. i. 18—iii. 20 is an interruption to Paul's description of the Gospel, an interruption designed to prove man's deep need of the salvation therein announced. In ch. iii. 21 we emerge from the dark shadow as suddenly as in ch. i. 18 we entered it. And, emerging from the shadow, we find ourselves where we were before it darkened our path, but with a deeper sense of spiritual need. In ch. iii. 21, 22 we have an expanded repetition of the statement already made in ch. i. 17: *But now, apart from law, a righteousness of God has been manifested, witness being borne to it by the Law and the Prophets; a righteousness of God through belief of Jesus Christ for all who believe.*

This conspicuous repetition suggests very strongly that these words assert a fundamental principle of Paul's theology. And this presumption is raised to complete certainty by the argument following, which is, as we shall see, a logical and spiritual development of the words just quoted.

The next step in our research is to determine as accurately and fully as possible the meaning of the words which we have now traced to the pen, and to the inmost thought, of Paul.

LECTURE IX.

RIGHTEOUSNESS AND LAW.

INASMUCH as the New Testament was written in an ancient language known to us only by ancient documents, the exact meaning of St. Paul's words can be determined only by careful study of the Science of Language and especially of the Greek language in which they were written. Thus theology, which has already in this work received contributions from Natural Science, Ethics, and History, now requires important aid from Philology and Grammar.

TWO GROUPS OF WORDS at once arrest our attention in the passages before us: *righteous, righteousness, righteousness of God;* and the cognate words *faith* or *belief* and *believe.* These words we shall find to be a conspicuous feature of the teaching of Paul. They demand our most careful study.

With words of the New Testament are associated TWO DISTINCT CLASSES OF IDEAS. They are Greek words, and consequently carry with them the associations of Greek life and thought, and receive abundant illustration from every page of the literature of ancient Greece. But the writers were Jews, deeply familiar

with the Old Testament written in Hebrew and embodying Hebrew thought. An important link between these two circles of thought is the Septuagint Version which found Greek equivalents for Hebrew words, and presented in a Greek dress the best thoughts of the Hebrew race. In our study of the words of the New Testament we must ever bear in mind their use and associations in Classical Greek and their use as familiar equivalents of familiar Hebrew words.

It is also worthy of note that the English language, which is to some extent a Latin superstructure built upon a German foundation, has two distinct equivalents for many Greek and Hebrew words and families of words. For example, the English family of words embracing *righteous* and *righteousness* represents the same Greek and Hebrew words as do the English words *just* and *justice*. This frequently leads to confusion, or at least obscures the writer's reference. Similarly the English words *belief* or *believe* and *faith* have only one equivalent in the languages of the Bible. This identity in Greek with difference in English must ever be kept in mind.

Of RIGHTEOUSNESS as understood by the Greeks we have a long and valuable exposition in bk. v. of Aristotle's *Nic. Ethics*. In ch. 2. 8 he says: "The unrighteous has been defined to be the unlawful and the unequal; and the righteous, the lawful and equal." The words *lawful* and *equal* imply a STANDARD with which that which is *righteous* must be compared and WITH WHICH IT AGREES. Throughout the Bible

the word is very common in the same sense. We have in Lev. xix. 36 *righteous* balances, weights, and measures; in Matt. xx. 4, Col. iv. 1, *righteous* wages; in 2 Tim. iv. 8, "the *righteous* Judge"; and in Rom. ii. 5, Acts iv. 19, John vii. 24, *righteous* conduct and judgment. Wherever used in Classical Greek, in the New Testament, in the Lxx., and in the Hebrew Bible, the words rendered *righteous* and *righteousness* denote agreement with a recognised standard. And always in the Bible and nearly always in Classical Greek they denote an agreement demanded by morality. Even lifeless weights and measures must correspond with the recognised standard, or the man who uses them is dishonest. They are therefore appropriately spoken of as *righteous*.

Since a common and recognised standard of right is a conspicuous element in the transactions of man with man, the words *righteous* and *unrighteous* are frequently used to describe such transactions. To this specific use of the word, Aristotle draws, in his *Nic. Ethics*, bk. v. 2, special attention.

Comparison and agreement imply a JUDGE who compares and who notes the agreement. Hence the phrases *righteous in his own eyes*, or *before God*, in Job xxxii. 1, Luke i. 6. When we speak of others as *righteous* or *unrighteous*, we set up ourselves as judges of their action and character. And such judgment always assumes a recognised and common standard of right and wrong. When the writers of the Bible (*e.g.* Rom. iii. 26) speak of God as *righteous*

they mean that His action agrees with this recognised standard.

It was ever present to the thought of Israel that the unseen Maker of heaven and earth had marked out a path along which He would have His rational creatures to go, and that He will reward or punish all men according as they walk along or forsake this path. Moreover the chosen Nation knew that the Lawgiver and Judge of all men was in a special sense the God of Israel; and that He had promised to Israel, on condition of obedience, very great blessings. This conception of God necessarily moulded and coloured the Jewish conception of *righteousness*, and indeed distinguishes it from the Greek conception. To Jewish thought that man was RIGHTEOUS who WALKS IN THE PATH MARKED OUT FOR HIM BY GOD, WHO THEREFORE ENJOYS THE FAVOUR OF GOD, AND WILL OBTAIN THE BLESSINGS WHICH HE HAS PROMISED TO THE RIGHTEOUS. The condition of that man is RIGHTEOUSNESS.

This conception of righteousness underlies the entire Bible. So Deut. xxiv. 13, "it shall be righteousness to thee before Jehovah, thy God:" *i.e.* to return the pledged garment at sunset, shall bring the favour and blessing of God. Similarly, ch. vi. 25; also Luke i. 6 "they were both righteous before God, going in all the commandments and decrees of the Lord blameless." In Romans ix. 31, Paul describes His nation as "pursuing a law of righteousness," but says that to such a law Israel "had not attained"; *i.e.* they were seeking

a standard by which they might obtain the favour of God, but had not found one.

Closely associated with the idea of righteousness is that of LAW, a word denoting the standard with which the righteous man or action agrees. So Aristotle, quoted above, speaks of the *righteous* as the *lawful* or *law-abiding*. And this connection of thought runs conspicuously throughout the Bible.

A LAW is a setting forth, by an authority claiming to determine or limit the conduct of others, of what they ought to do or not to do. So Prov. iii. 1: "My son, forget not my law; but let thy heart keep my commandments." The state claims this right over its citizens; and therefore its enactments are called *laws*. And, since without penalties enactments are powerless, the laws of the state announce both what the citizens are to do and not to do and the punishment of disobedience. The laws of an absolute monarch are an announcement of his will touching the conduct of his subjects.

To Israel, as already stated, God was the only King and Lawgiver and Judge. Consequently, in the Bible, unless otherwise stated, the word *law* always denotes THE LAW OF GOD.

In the Pentateuch we read that at Sinai, through the agency of Moses, God gave to Israel a body of definite prescriptions to be henceforth their national law and the basis of God's future dealings with the nation whom He had joined to Himself by solemn covenant. This historical statement, all the writers of the New Testa-

ment accept as true; and they accept as authoritative the recorded words of God to Israel. So expressly, Rom. v. 20, Gal. iii. 17, 19, etc. They had no doubt whatever that the abstract principle of law, viz., that the Ruler of the world will treat all men according to their conduct as compared with the standard which He has laid down for them, had assumed at Sinai concrete HISTORICAL FORM. And, inasmuch as the commands then given were recorded in well-known books extant in Paul's day and in our own day, in these books this principle of law assumed LITERARY FORM. A single statement is called a *law*: so Lev. vi. 9, "this is the *law* of the burnt offering." In Deut. xxx. 10, Moses exhorts Israel to "hearken to the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe His commandments and His ordinances, even that which is written in this book of the *law*." Similarly, Josh. i. 8, viii. 34, 2 Kings xxii. 8, 11, Neh. viii. 1. The book itself, as being a permanent and authoritative embodiment of God's will, is called *the Law*: 1 Kings ii. 3, 1 Chron. xvi. 40, 2 Chron. xxiii. 18, xxxi. 3, xxxv. 26, Ezra iii. 2. Hence in the New Testament *the Law* is a frequent designation of the Pentateuch. So Rom. iii. 21, "the Law and the Prophets;" Luke xxiv. 44, Acts xxiv. 14. In other places, quotations from the prophets and the Book of Psalms are spoken of as contained in *the Law*. So Rom. iii. 19, "so many things as the Law says," referring to the foregoing quotations from the Psalms and the Book of Isaiah. And John xv. 25, "written in their Law," followed by a quotation from Psalms xxxv. 19,

lxix. 4. This implies that by Paul and others the later books of the Old Testament were accepted as, along with the Pentateuch, an AUTHORITATIVE DECLARATION OF THE WILL OF GOD.

The entire Old Testament is an embodiment of the principle DO THIS AND LIVE. So Rom. x. 5 : "Moses writes that the man who has done the righteousness which is from law shall live in it." This is the essence of law : and in the legislation of Sinai and in the Jewish Scriptures this broad principle assumed historical and literary form. This principle is the spirit, and the books are the body, of the Law. And the word *law* is used sometimes in reference to its inner spirit, at other times in reference to its outer historical or literary form. Hence the apparent variety in the use of the word. But everywhere the underlying significance is the same. The Law is the divinely-erected standard of human conduct, and obedience to it is the divinely-ordained condition of the favour of God.

Of the same broad principle of right as binding upon all men, all human legislation is an embodiment. But, inasmuch as the Gentiles had no written law given by a superhuman Lawgiver, the word *law* was to them a less definite term, and had no historical significance. In this sense they were "without law."

The gift of a written law to Israel only divided the human race into the two great divisions so conspicuous in the Epistles of Paul : so Rom. ii. 12, 27, etc. Yet Paul asserts that each of these divisions will be judged by law ; that is to say that all men everywhere will be

treated according to their actions, these being compared with a common standard. This implies that even to the Gentiles an authoritative standard has been given. And this universal standard Paul finds (Rom. ii. 14, 15) in the law WRITTEN ON THE HEARTS of all men, in the inborn moral sense. This unwritten yet deeply written law, we have in Lect. III. found to be the supreme rule of human conduct and of man's estimate of himself and others.

The relation between the law written within and that written on the tables of stone and on the pages of the Bible and in the best literature of the world is worthy of special attention. To the inner law, all outer law appeals, and from it derives authority. The moral teaching of the Bible, apart from its historical origin, compels us, by its re-echo in our own moral sense, to accept it as decisive. Indeed the moral sense compels us to accept as the voice of God much moral teaching which in its historical origin is purely human. The inner law, although by no means infallible and although needing to be instructed, is until better instructed the supreme rule of moral obligation. On the other hand, the voice within is greatly strengthened by external authority. The voice from without seems to wake up, and give fresh authority to, the voice within.

Turning again to the Books of Moses, we notice in them TWO very different CLASSES of commands holding very different relations to the universal moral sense of men, yet each invested in the Law of Moses with the same authority. A good example is found in Lev. xix.

18, 19 where, after the great command "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" follows a prohibition to use "a garment of two kinds of stuff mingled together." In short we have, strangely intertwined, moral precepts which our moral sense recognises at once as binding upon all men in all ages and ritual commands which the moral sense of our day refuses to recognise as of abiding validity. Yet to ancient Israel each of these classes of commands had the highest divine sanction. For there was historical evidence that the entire Law came from God as His will touching His covenant people.

The distinction just noted is of great importance, but of great difficulty. It will be discussed in another volume when we consider the relation of the servants of Christ to the Law of Moses.

At this point we will sum up the practical result of our investigation. Paul taught, as we have seen, that the Creator of man has woven into man's nature a moral standard, and that every man will be judged and will receive reward or punishment according to his agreement with this standard in action and character; and that to Israel God gave, in the Decalogue and in the legislation of Sinai, a written outline of this law, and required as a condition of His favour obedience to the law thus given. We notice also in this written law, along with moral precepts, ordinances of ritual and certain prohibitions peculiar to Israel. The man whose conduct and disposition agree with the law is *righteous*, and his state is *righteousness*. This teaching and this

fuller conception of righteousness run through the entire Old Testament.

In the above summary we have not assumed the historical truth of the whole narrative of Exodus; but we have simply accepted as indisputable that Paul believed that that narrative is a record of actual historical fact. That this belief is substantially correct, we have, apart from any special authority of Holy Scripture, abundant evidence. For, the entire Old Testament reveals the deep conviction of Israel that at Sinai God spoke to their fathers and gave to them special commands; and this definite and deep conviction can be accounted for only by the historical truth of the belief which moulded so completely and so beneficially the thought of the nation.

We may go one step further. Apart from the historical truth of the narrative of Sinai, the faith of Paul and of Israel is verified by the decisive testimony of our own moral sense. A voice within speaking with an authority we dare not contradict or resist compels us to believe that our highest well-being is conditioned by conformity with the standard inwoven into the texture of our moral nature.

This assured result must be a standard for all further research. We can accept as true only that which is in harmony with this law of our being. Moreover, that Paul and the writers of the New Testament recognise the great moral truth quoted above and make it the foundation of their teaching secures for them at once our confidence and respect.

LECTURE X.

UNIVERSAL SIN AND RUIN.

IN Lect. IV. we found a wide-spread conviction of personal SIN and a dark apprehension of PUNISHMENT beyond the grave; coupled with a consciousness of inward moral BONDAGE holding us back, with a fetter we could not break, from doing that which our better sense approves and commands. This inward condemnation and bondage, we found in our own hearts by immediate introspection, and we found it reflected in darkest colours on the pages of human literature.

The same picture of the moral state of man, we find reflected also in the Epistles of Paul. A somewhat full description of the state both of Gentiles and of Jews apart from the Gospel is inserted between the preliminary exposition of the Gospel in Rom. i. 16, 17 and the fuller exposition in ch. iii. 21, 22. In ch. i. 18-32 Paul teaches that in the works of creation God revealed Himself to the Gentiles in order to leave them without excuse for sin; and that their gross immorality is a manifestation of God's anger against them for turning away from the revelation thus offered into the

folly of idolatry. In ch. ii. he teaches that all men will be judged according to their deeds, and that the gift of the Law to the Jews only is no proof or presumption that they will escape; for the Law announces salvation only to those who obey it. In ch. iii. 9, at the close of the above argument, Paul says that he has proved both Jews and Greeks to be all under sin, and points out that this proof is in harmony with Ps. xiv. 1-3. Then follow other Old Testament quotations describing wicked Israelites. These quotations he speaks of in *v.* 19 as taken from "the Law"; and says that they were written in order to close every mouth and to bring all the world before the bar of God. That all men have actually sinned, is again asserted in *v.* 23.

The same teaching underlies all the Epistles of Paul. In Rom. v. 8, 10 he speaks of himself and his readers as having been "sinners" and "enemies." The same is implied in the words "reconciled us to Himself" and "reconciling the world to Himself" and "be reconciled to God" in 2 Cor. v. 18-20. Similarly Eph. ii. 16, Col. i. 21. All these passages imply that apart from the Gospel all men are at war with God. And this we can well understand. For every king must treat as enemies those who break his laws. They have therefore to reckon him as in a very real sense their enemy; while in another sense, even in his hostility, he is their friend. In Eph. ii. 1-3 Paul speaks of his readers as being formerly "dead through" their "trespasses and sins"; and as following at that time the

guidance of evil, accompanied in this erring path by himself and by all other men, and consequently "children of anger," *i.e.* men exposed to the anger of God.

In another volume we shall find Paul teaching that apart from the Gospel all men are held fast and held down by an inward power compelling them to continue in sin, a power from which no human moral effort can save them.

Throughout the New Testament we have the same teaching. Universality of actual sin is implied in the Baptist's announcement in Mark i. 4, etc. of a "Baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins." And it is frequently implied in the recorded teaching of Christ. For instance, in John viii. 34, to Jews who resented His promise of liberation on the ground that they had never been in bondage, He replied by the broad assertion, "Every one that commits sin is a slave of sin." This reply assumes that all men are sinners; otherwise it would be no proof that the persons addressed needed liberation.

This teaching of Paul and of Christ accords with our own experience and observation. And this agreement renders needless and useless any attempt to prove it. Unless we are immediately conscious of guilt, none can persuade us. This sense of moral ruin is the necessary starting point for all further study of the Gospel of Christ. Only those who are conscious of personal sin and are trembling under the anger of God will welcome the good tidings of pardon announced by Christ and by Paul.

To men guilty of past sin and unable to obey in the future and therefore needing both pardon and moral liberation, GOD GAVE, as Paul confidently believed, A written translation of the LAW already inwoven into their moral nature; and that written law continued till his day as the abiding condition of the favour of God. The same law in its main outlines abides still, by its appeal to our own moral sense, as the supreme authority in human life.

It is at once evident that such a law CANNOT SAVE. It is powerless to save because man is both guilty and powerless to obey. "The Law was weak through the flesh:" Rom. viii. 3. For to the guilty it speaks only condemnation; and gives no help to those who are unable to fulfil its commands.

Mark now THE RESULT of the gift of such a law to such men. In men of keen moral sensibility, its first result is intense and painful effort to obey. For the commands of the external law wake up echoes from the law written within. And, as each strenuous effort to do right only reveals the presence of an inward and hostile power compelling the sinner to continue in wrongdoing, he is left helpless and trembling beneath a voice of thunder from which there is no escape. Thus painful moral effort deepens into moral despair. Others of looser moral fibre, finding themselves unable to obey, acquiesce in their failure; and in their felt moral weakness abandon themselves to sin. Others again select from the Law such details as they can obey; and, in spite of the Law's demand

for observance of all its precepts, trust for the Judge's favour to a fragmentary obedience. Thus in every case the Law fails to save. And this is the inevitable result of the gift of a spiritual law to men under the bondage of sin.

IS then the LAW itself a FAILURE? If so, it must have been a foreseen failure. For God knew who they were to whom He gave the Law, and He foresaw the inevitable result of His gift. With profound reverence we ask, Why did God give, to men needing salvation, that which could not save? The only answer is that beyond the immediate apparent failure lies some further purpose for whose accomplishment the apparent failure was designed to prepare the way. Thus from the darkness of our moral despair shines a ray of hope. For the Great Lawgiver cannot mock His helpless creatures.

This ray of hope we find reflected in the EXPRESS TEACHING of Paul. In Rom. iii. 19 he asserts that the inevitable result noted above is also the DESIGNED RESULT of the Law. It was given in order to produce in all men a consciousness of personal guilt. In Paul himself and in many like him that purpose was indisputably accomplished. And, as human literature bears witness, a similar result has followed in many others who have bowed to the authority of the ancient law given to Israel; and again in not a few who have been unable to contradict the condemnation pronounced upon them by their own inborn moral sense. In Rom. v. 20 Paul says that between Adam and Moses the Law

came into the course of human history in order that Adam's one transgression of a definite command might multiply into the many similar transgressions of his descendants. This multiplication of actual law-breaking has revealed the infinite evil of sin as this could not have been revealed had no definite commands been given to Adam's children. In Gal. iii. 22 we read that the written word has shut up all men as if in prison, and that they were held in guard by the Law, in order that to those who believe, and through faith, might be given the blessings promised to Abraham. This last passage asserts in plainest language that the Law was given in order to prepare a way for the Gospel.

The NEED FOR this peculiar PREPARATION is not difficult to understand. It will be still better understood when the nature and method of that salvation have been expounded. After a preliminary announcement to Abraham of blessings to come designed for all mankind, but before the full announcement in Christ of those blessings as a present enjoyment, God spoke the Law from Sinai and made its observance a condition of His favour in order to reveal the absolute need of a salvation infinitely beyond reach of all that man can do; and in order that thus man may understand and appreciate the salvation provided for him by God and the infinite wisdom and love therein manifested. Only by this intelligent appreciation of the salvation wrought out for him in Christ can man, as an intelligent being, appropriate and enjoy the blessings designed for him by God. The Law is thus a dark

background needful to show forth the splendour of the Gospel of Christ.

We now see that the Law, inwoven into man's heart of hearts, as is attested by our own moral judgments about ourselves and others and by the literature of the world, and given, as Paul and his nation believed, to Israel at Sinai in written form, does nothing immediately to relieve man's felt need of pardon and of moral liberation. It has rather intensified this need. At the same time, the gift of the Law reveals GOD'S INTEREST IN MAN and His desire that he may do right and refuse evil. This indication of divine care AWAKENS HOPE that God will use means adequate to our deep need. We notice also that the promises of blessing to Abraham and to his seed were earlier than the Law, and therefore cannot be set aside (cp. Gal. iii. 17) by the Law afterwards given; and that the Books of the Law, and especially the later prophetic books which the Jews placed (cp. Rom. iii. 19, John x. 34) on the same level of authority as the recorded legislation of Sinai, contained definite promises of salvation. With Deut. vi. 5, compare ch. xxx. 6: see also Ezek xxxvi. 25-27. For the relief we need, which the Law cannot directly give, and for the fulfilment of the hopes aroused by the ancient promises, we turn now to that Gospel which Paul declared to be "a power of God, for salvation, to everyone who believes."

A fuller account of the state of man apart from the Gospel and of the relation of his present condition to

the first sin of Adam will be given in my next volume. This picture of moral ruin, for which we shall be indebted chiefly to the great Apostle of the Gentiles, will there form the dark background for a more complete delineation of the salvation wrought out for man by Christ and in Christ. In this volume I have discussed the lost state of man only so far as is needful for the present stage of our inquiry.

LECTURE XI.

RIGHTEOUSNESS THROUGH FAITH.

WE now turn, in our search for salvation, to the Gospel announced in Rom. i. 16. These words evidently mean that the good news announced by Christ is an instrument through which the infinite power of God is put forth to rescue from the penalty and power of sin all those, Jews or Gentiles, who believe the good news. This statement Paul goes on to explain by saying that in the Gospel is revealed a RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD, BY FAITH and for faith; and that this is in harmony with an ancient prophecy which announced, in view of impending disaster, that by faith the righteous man will live. He means that while the Gospel is preached a veil is lifted disclosing a "righteousness of God;" that this unveiling is brought about in each case by faith and is designed to lead to faith; and that in the Gospel the saving power of God is put forth for all who believe.

Similarly, in ch. iii. 21, after proving that both Jews and Greeks are all under the burden of sin and that the Law was given to bring all the world speechless and guilty before God, Paul suddenly and triumphantly

declares, "But now, apart from law, a righteousness of God has been manifested, testimony being given in its favour by the Law and the Prophets, a righteousness of God through belief of Jesus Christ for all who believe." He means that, although the ancient Scriptures bear witness to the manifestation afterwards made in Paul's day, this manifestation itself was made on principles independent of the great principle underlying the Law, viz. that God's favour is conditional on obedience to His commands. The words "through faith" and "for all that believe" correspond respectively to "by faith" and "for faith" in ch. i. 17.

The most important part of these assertions is the conspicuous phrase, three times used, RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD. It demands now our best attention. Already we have seen that *righteousness* is that conformity with the supreme standard of right which the Judge accepts as the condition of participation in the blessings promised to Israel. Our chief difficulty is the relation described by the words *of God.* In ch. iii. 5, 25, 26 *God's righteousness*, etc., is evidently an attribute of God, viz. the agreement of His words and actions with the standard laid down for man. For in *v.* 5 the phrase *righteousness of God* was suggested by a quotation from Ps. li. 4, "that Thou mayest be justified in Thy words," and is contrasted with "our unrighteousness;" and in *vv.* 25, 26 the same phrase is explained by the words following, "that He may be Himself *righteous* and a justifier of him that has faith." This *righteousness of God* differs from that of man only as God, the Judge,

differs from man who is judged. A man is righteous whose conduct agrees with that prescribed in the Law: a judge is righteous who impartially pronounces sentence according to the declarations of the Law. And in this sense, in Rom. iii. 5, 25, 26 we read of the *righteousness of God.*

This simple meaning of the term will, however, not satisfy the conditions of Rom. i. 17, iii. 21, 22. For the harmony of God's action with His own law was revealed, not in the Gospel, but long before Christ was born. It underlies conspicuously the entire Old Testament: cp. Ezek. xviii. 25, 29, Ezra ix. 15, Ps. vii. 9, xi. 7, Jer. xii. 1. Nor would the revelation of God's attribute of righteousness prove the Gospel to be "a power of God for salvation." Nor again would it present any parallel to the prophecy of Habakkuk, "the righteous man will live by faith." Moreover, in no sense can it be said that the manifestation of God's attribute of righteousness was "apart from law." Nor was it "through belief of Jesus Christ": for this divine attribute is less conspicuous in the New Testament than in the Old. These accumulated objections compel us, in spite of its use in Rom. iii. 5, 25, 26, to seek for the phrase *righteousness of God* in *vv.* 21, 22 and in ch. i. 17 another meaning.

The same phrase meets us again twice in Rom. x. 3. In ch. ix. 30 we read that "Gentiles, the men who were not pursuing righteousness, have obtained righteousness, even the righteousness which is by faith. But Israel, while pursuing a law of righteousness, has not attained

to such law." This Paul explains by saying that "not knowing the *righteousness of God*, and seeking to set up their own righteousness, they have not submitted to the *righteousness of God*." This cannot mean that the Jews were ignorant of God's impartial administration of His own laws. Nor would such ignorance explain their rejection of the Gospel. Nor again would this rejection be described as a refusal to "submit to the *righteousness of God*." Evidently these last words are a contrast to "their own righteousness," and to "the righteousness which is from law," in *v.* 5. We notice also in *v.* 6, in close agreement with ch. i. 17, "the righteousness which is by faith," an evident contrast to the foregoing righteousness "by works" and "from law."

In 2 Cor. v. 21 we read: "Him who knew no sin, on our behalf He made to be sin, in order that we may become *righteousness of God* in Him." The earlier part of this sentence can only mean that God made Christ to be, by His suffering and death, a manifestation of the nature of sin, so that by contemplating Him who knew no sin men may learn its deadly effect. The latter part of the sentence cannot mean that men are to become an attribute of God. It evidently describes the reconciliation to God so conspicuous in *vv.* 18-20.

A close parallel to Rom. x. 3 is found in Phil. iii. 9. Paul desires "to be found in Him, not having a righteousness of my own, that which is from law, but that which is through belief of Christ, the righteousness which is from God on the condition of faith." Evidently "not having a righteousness of my own" is a contrast to

"seeking to set up their own righteousness." And the further description, "that which is from law" reproduces exactly "the righteousness which is from law" in Rom. x. 5. The contrasted phrase, "the righteousness which is from God on the condition of faith," is a conspicuous parallel to the ignored "*righteousness of God*" and to "the righteousness from faith" in Rom. x. 3, 6.

Putting together all these passages and observing that they all refer conspicuously to the salvation announced by Christ on the condition of faith, accepted by Paul, but rejected by most of the Jews, it is impossible to doubt that the phrase *righteousness of God* in Rom. i. 17, iii. 21, 22 is equivalent to "the righteousness from faith" in Rom. x. 6, and to "the righteousness from God on the condition of faith" in Phil. iii. 9. If so, the *righteousness of God* in these passages is a righteousness which God gives; just as "the peace of God" in Phil. iv. 7 is a peace which God gives. So in John xiv. 27: "My peace I give to you." It is that conformity with the divinely erected standard which God requires as a condition of His favour and of the blessings which He has promised, a conformity which is also God's gift. As such, it is a marked contrast to Paul's "own righteousness," a righteousness derived, if at all, "from law." It is revealed in the Gospel: for, until the good news announced by Christ, conformity with the will of God was only an object of vain effort. By announcing salvation for all who believe, God made known and gave to men a conformity with the divinely prescribed condition of the favour of God unknown before. This

fulfilment of the divinely imposed condition is "through faith of Christ." And this condition was announced "for faith"; *i.e.* in order that henceforth faith may be man's mental attitude towards God. As independent of previous obedience to the law, it is "apart from law." But Paul shows that faith as a condition of the favour of God is in harmony with various statements in the Old Testament. Thus righteousness through faith receives "testimony from the Law and the Prophets." And we shall find it to be an instrument used by the "power of God, for salvation, to all that believe."

If the above exposition be correct, Paul asserts in Rom. i. 17, iii. 21, 22 that GOD RECEIVES INTO HIS FAVOUR ALL WHO BELIEVE the good news announced by Christ. They enjoy the Judge's approval, and will obtain the blessings promised by God. Consequently, righteousness is theirs; a righteousness not their own, *i.e.* derived from their own effort, but received as a gift from God by belief of the good news announced by Christ. They have found what all men need, and what many Jews in Paul's day sought earnestly, the approval of the great Judge before whose eyes all human action and thought lie open and before whose judgment seat all men must some day stand. We seek further information touching this wonderful gift of righteousness.

Passing from Rom. iii. 21, 22 to *v.* 24, we notice the word BEING-JUSTIFIED, an English rendering of the present participle passive of a Greek verb meaning *to make-righteous.* The same verb occurs again in *v.* 26: "that He may be Himself righteous and a

justifier of Him that has faith in Jesus." In *v.* 28 the foregoing teaching is summed up in the words "For we reckon that a man is *justified* by faith apart from works of law"; and again in *v.* 30, "God who will *justify* the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision through their faith." The whole context forbids us to doubt that these passages, so closely related each to the others, are equivalent to the conspicuous assertion in *vv.* 21, 22, "righteousness of God apart from law . . . through faith." They will therefore shed light upon it.

The word *justify* occurs in Rom. ii. 13: "Not the hearers of law are righteous before God, but the doers of law will be *justified* . . . in the day when God will judge the secrets of men." This cannot mean that in the great day "the doers of law" will be made actually righteous: for as "doers of law" they are already righteous. It is evidently equivalent to "righteous before God," and asserts that they who obey the Law will be treated as righteous, *i.e.* will receive the reward of their obedience. Similarly in Rom. iii. 4, the Psalmist is quoted as saying to God "that Thou mayest be justified in Thy words." Evidently the Psalmist desires that God's essential righteousness may be recognised by men. So *v.* 20: "by works of law shall no flesh be *justified* before Him." In each of these passages the word *justify* indisputably means, not to make actually righteous, but in thought or word or act to TREAT A MAN AS RIGHTEOUS.

Throughout the New Testament the word is used in the same forensic sense. Matt. xii. 37 is a close parallel

to Rom. ii. 13. In "the day of judgment," according to their words on earth, will men be *justified* or condemned. Here manifestly to justify and to condemn are the contrasted awards of the great Judge. Abraham's justification by offering up Isaac, in James ii. 21, refers evidently to God's conspicuous recognition of his obedience recorded in Gen. xxii. 16-18. Similarly in Luke x. 29, xvi. 15 we find men who *justify* themselves, not by reforming their own conduct and disposition, but by endeavouring to represent themselves as righteous.

The same use of the same Greek word is common in the LXX. It is there a technical term for a judge's sentence in a man's favour. So Deut. xxv. 1, "Thou shalt *justify* the righteous and condemn the wicked;" Prov. xvii. 15, "He that *justifies* the wicked and he that condemns the righteous . . . are an abomination to the Lord;" 1 Kings viii. 32, "Hear Thou in heaven and judge Thy servants, condemning the wicked, to bring his way upon his own head, and *justifying* the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness." Similarly, Job xxxii. 2, "He *justified* himself rather than God; and ch. xxxiii. 32, "Speak, for I desire to justify thee." In all these cases the meaning is indisputable—viz., to make a man righteous, not objectively, but subjectively, from the judge's point of view.

In Isa. liii. 11, Dan. xii. 3, and there only, the corresponding Hebrew word means possibly or probably to make actually righteous; but it is not reproduced by the Greek rendering now before us. Throughout the Greek Bible we have no clear case in which the word

justify is used in the sense of making a person objectively righteous; but we have very many cases in which it denotes subjective treatment of oneself or of others as righteous. This meaning is also implied in its constant contrast to the word *condemn*, which means indisputably, not to make a man wicked, but to treat him as such.

In classical Greek the word *justify* means to reckon or claim something as a right; or, with a personal object, to treat a person justly. It occurs six times in bk. v. 9. 2, 3 of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, where δικαιοῦσθαι, *to be justified i.e.* to receive justice, is contrasted with ἀδικεῖσθαι, to receive injustice. Not unfrequently it is found in the sense of punish, *i.e.* to do to a man what justice demands. This meaning is closely related to the use of the word in the LXX. So far as I know, it is never used in classical Greek in the sense of making one actually righteous.

Paul declares in Rom. iii. 26, 28, 30 and again twice in Gal. ii. 16 (cp. *v.* 17), also ch. iii. 8 (cp. *v.* 24), that apart from works done in obedience to law God *justifies* those who believe; or something to the same effect. The comparative frequency of the word *justify* in the New Testament and in the LXX. compels us, in the absence of any reasons to the contrary, to give to it the same meaning here. In other words, Paul taught that they who believe the good news announced by Christ have no need to wait till the great assize in order to know their destiny, that to them the Judge has already spoken, and spoken in their favour; and

that this favourable sentence is not, and will not be, obtained by works done in obedience to law but by belief of the words of Christ.

This clear teaching raises to complete certainty our exposition of Rom. iii. 21, 22. For those who are *justified* must be *righteous*; and their condition may be described as *righteousness*. And, since God justifies men "by faith apart from works of law," they have a "*righteousness of God*, apart from law, through faith." Evidently, Rom. iii. 26, 28, 30 do but repeat in a slightly altered form the conspicuous statement in *vv.* 21, 22.

A remarkable coincidence with Rom. iii. 26, 28, 30, etc., is found in Acts xiii. 39, where in an address at Antioch in Pisidia Paul asserts emphatically that in Christ "every one that believes is justified from all things from which ye could not be justified in the Law of Moses." This coincidence is the more remarkable because nowhere else in the New Testament do we meet the phrase "justified through faith" except in the Epistles of Paul. It is an independent and ancient witness (see p. 52) that justification through faith was an important element of the preaching of Paul.

Closely following the phrases just discussed, we find another very similar phrase, FAITH RECKONED FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS. So (quoted from Gen. xv. 6) Rom. iv. 3, also *vv.* 5, 9, 11, 22, 23, 24. Note also *v.* 6, "the man to whom God *reckons righteousness* apart from works;" and *v.* 8, "blessed is the man to whom God does not reckon sin," quoted from Ps.

xxxii. 1. Inwoven with this new phraseology, we meet the earlier forms; "justified by works" in Rom. iv. 2, "justifies the ungodly" in *v.* 5, and "righteousness of faith" in *v.* 13.

This new phrase takes us back to the dark night at Mamre, and to the tent where the lonely patriarch was nursing his loneliness and fear. We remember how God came to Abraham, brought him out from the gloomy tent and directed him to the bright stars of heaven and said, in words never to be forgotten, "So shall be thy seed. And Abraham believed in Jehovah: and He reckoned it to him as righteousness." The meaning of these last words is explained in *v.* 18: "in that day God made a covenant with Abraham." Evidently Abraham's belief of the promise was the divinely-appointed condition on which hung its fulfilment. Abraham believed: God then entered into definite alliance with him, and in due time fulfilled and will yet still further fulfil the promise made to him. This covenant was the clearest possible proof that Abraham possessed the favour of God. He obtained it by believing the word and promise of God.

This treatment of Abraham by God, recorded in Gen. xv. 5, Paul uses as a confirmatory parallel to God's reception into His favour, through Christ, of those who believe the Gospel. This unexpected parallel is most important. To men who boasted in their father Abraham and in the Old Covenant, Paul shows that God's favour to and covenant with Abraham were

obtained, not by obedience to law—for no written and definite law had then been given—but by belief of a divine promise. In Paul's day God had spoken again, had made a New Covenant with man, and was daily receiving into His favour all who believe the words of Christ.

The meaning of the phrase *reckon for righteousness* is open to no doubt. Already we have seen that by usage the word *justify* has appropriated to itself a subjective and forensic sense. In the phrase before us this subjective sense finds clear expression in the word *reckon.* To Paul's thought, *righteousness* was the divinely-appointed condition of His favour and of the blessings promised to Israel. In former days the Pharisee had sought this favour by exact obedience to a written law. But he had now learnt that the *faith* of those who believe the words of Jesus is accepted, in the merciful *reckoning* of God, as a fulfilment of the required condition. In other words, the phrase before us is a third way of stating the fundamental doctrine of Paul that God receives into His favour all who believe the good news announced by Christ.

Very interesting as illustrating the meaning of the words *reckon for righteousness* are Ps. cvi. 31, which is a comment on Num. xxv. 10—13, and 1 Maccabees ii. 52 which expounds the reward promised to Abraham in Gen. xxii. 16—18. The sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham and the loyal act of Phineas were reckoned for righteousness in the sense that God graciously accepted them as actions to be rewarded.

This third phrase confirms strongly our exposition of the evidently equivalent phrases, *righteousness of God through faith*, and *justified through faith*. For it is manifestly and conspicuously forensic.

Already we have seen that Paul looked on all men as guilty of actual sin. To such men, justification, *i.e.* the judge's sentence in their favour, is practically PARDON. And, in agreement with the fundamental doctrine already traced to the pen and lips of Paul, we find in Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14 "the forgiveness of sins," and in Col. ii. 13 "having forgiven us all trespasses."

A remarkable coincidence is found in Acts xiii. 38, xxvi. 18, where Paul is recorded as announcing "forgiveness of sins." In the former of these two passages this forgiveness is further expounded by the words already quoted, "in this Man every one that believes is justified." This coincidence, coming from an independent witness of high character, greatly strengthens our proof that this phrase was actually used by the great Apostle, and used in the sense expounded above. It also confirms the truthfulness of the Book of Acts as a record of the actual teaching of Paul.

In Rom. v. 1 we read, "Let us then, justified by faith, have PEACE WITH GOD." Afterwards, in *v.* 9, Paul assumes that his readers have already been "justified in the blood" of Christ, and bases upon this assumed fact a hope of future salvation. In *v.* 10 he repeats in parallel terms this inference of hope, replacing the phrase "justified in His blood" by "RECONCILED TO

GOD through the death of His Son." This "reconciliation" is again mentioned in *v.* 11. Similarly, in 2 Cor. v. 18—20 Paul writes "God has reconciled us to Himself through Christ . . . God was, in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself . . . and put in us the word of reconciliation . . . as ambassadors on behalf of Christ, we beg, Be reconciled to God." Similar phraseology meets us again in Eph. ii. 16, Col. i. 20, 22. All this implies that God gave Christ in order to reconcile to Himself men who were formerly enemies, and that in Paul and others this reconciliation was already accomplished.

Already in Lect. X. we have seen that Paul assumes that all men are, apart from the Gospel, enemies of God. This follows from his assumption that all men are sinners. For every king must treat as enemies those who break his laws and thus set themselves against the commonwealth. Even while he earnestly desires their good, his soldiers must pursue and possibly shoot down those who defy his rule. To such men pardon means reconciliation and peace. The pardoned criminal no longer looks at the monarch and his power as hostile. For pardon has restored the normal relation of king and subject. The Gospel preached by Paul announced the justification of all who believe it. It is therefore, to those who believe, a word of pardon: and pardon means peace where before there was ruinous war.

It is now evident that the five forms of speech just expounded are practically equivalent; that they do

but state one great doctrine. This, the FIRST great FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINE of Paul, we may in modern language thus state: GOD RECEIVES INTO HIS FAVOUR ALL WHO BELIEVE THE GOOD NEWS ANNOUNCED BY CHRIST.

Since to the Jews and especially to the Pharisees God's favour and the blessings He has promised were conditioned by conformity to a divinely-erected standard and since this conformity was called *righteousness*, Paul describes the reception of believers into God's favour as *righteousness through faith.* And so accustomed was he to think of God as a lawgiver that he describes in Rom. iii. 27 even the Gospel as "a law of faith." For to a Jew obedience to law is a constant condition of the favour of God: and faith is virtually obedience. Yet since faith as a condition of righteousness is altogether different from the condition required in the ancient law, Paul speaks in Rom. iii. 21 of the righteousness announced in the Gospel as "apart from law." And since this righteousness is a divine gift, in marked contrast to that for which the Jews sought by their own effort, Paul justly calls it (1) a *Righteousness of God* in contrast to man's "own righteousness."

This fundamental Gospel may also be described as justification. For it is the Judge's voice of acquittal. And, since we enter the number of those on whom God smiles by believing the words of Christ, it may be described as (2) *Justification through Faith.* Since faith is accepted by God as a fulfilment of the condition on which depends His favour, Paul may correctly

say, using the language of the Old Testament about Abraham, that (3) to believers *Faith is reckoned for Righteousness.* Since the justified were once condemned sinners, in their case acquittal or justification is (4) practically *Pardon.* Moreover, since all sin is rebellion against the great King, a rebellion which cannot be tolerated but must be put down if need be by a strong hand, sinners are enemies of God and must count on His righteous hostility. Consequently, to them the favour of God is (5) *Reconciliation to God* and *Peace with God.*

Each of these five modes of speech we have traced by complete documentary evidence to the pen of Paul. And two of them (nos. 2 and 4) we have traced to his lips in an independent record of his life and work. This abundant proof shuts out all doubt that the doctrine thus embodied was actually taught by him. And, that this one doctrine was clothed in these five different phrases, reveals its large place in the thought and heart of the great Apostle.

It may be objected that, since a mere imputed righteousness is worse than worthless, the term *righteousness through faith* must include inward conformity with the eternal standard of right. But we note that the equivalent terms *justified, reckoned for righteousness, pardon* do not suggest this inward righteousness. Nor does Paul, while discussing justification through faith, *e.g.* in Rom. iii. 21—v. 21 and Gal. iii. 1—v. 4, suggest it. On the other hand, in the teaching of Paul justification does not stand alone.

To the justified, God gives, as we shall see in our next volume, His Holy Spirit to be in them the animating principle of a new moral life. Only they who desire this new life can believe the Gospel. And only they who follow the guidance of the Spirit can retain the righteousness obtained by faith. Consequently, after expounding justification, Paul goes on to guard it by expounding the new life imparted by the Holy Spirit. But, when doing so, he forsakes all the five phrases noted above and uses other language to describe the new life. This change of phrase is very marked in Rom. viii. 1-17, Gal. v. 16—vi. 10. The word *righteousness* is found in Rom. vi. 16-20, xiv. 17, etc. But the phrases now before us are reserved to describe the forensic change.

On the other hand, Paul's constant teaching that the changed relation to God is always accompanied by an inward moral change, probably made it easier for him to describe the forensic change by the term *righteousness*. For the consequent inward change prevented the incongruity of a righteousness not connected with inward conformity with the eternal law of right.

We shall do well, however, to hold fast Paul's mode of expression. When he wishes to speak of God's reception into His favour of all who believe the Gospel, he calls it "righteousness through faith." When he wishes to describe the new moral life of the justified, he calls it the "guidance" and "the fruit of the Spirit."

As yet we have said nothing about repentance. But in Rom. ii. 4, 5, Paul teaches that God "is leading" men "to repentance," and that the man of "impenitent heart" is treasuring up for himself anger "in a day of anger." The relation of repentance to justification through faith will be discussed when we have considered the nature of faith

LECTURE XII.

THE NATURE OF FAITH.

WE have now found complete historical proof that, as matter of fact, Paul taught that God receives into His favour all who believe the good news announced by Christ. This great doctrine we may conveniently describe as *Justification through Faith.*

The importance of this doctrine in the Theology of Paul makes needful a careful study of the words *faith* and *believe*, and of the mental state which these words denote. This study I shall begin by examining the modern use of these English words. For, before we can understand their Hebrew and Greek equivalents, we must investigate the state of mind denoted by them. And this we can best do by examining the processes of our own thought as they find expression in our familiar mother-tongue. With our modern use of the English words, we shall then compare the use of their equivalents in the languages of the Bible.

We notice at once that we have two families of English words representing only one family in Hebrew and in Greek: *believe*, *belief*, and *faith*, *faithful*. This

has led to frequent confusion. The total difference of form suggests some essential difference between *faith* and *belief*. In the languages of the Bible there is no such difference. To *believe*, is to have *faith*; and conversely.

We *believe* when we are sure of something. Belief is MENTAL REST IN AN IDEA. The idea may have reference to past, present, or future. Our assurance may be derived from and rest upon immediate observation, upon inference from cause to effect or from effect to cause, or upon the testimony of a speaker. It may be true or false; it may rest upon a foundation which most careful scrutiny pronounces to be immovable or upon mere fancy; it may be of the utmost importance or of no importance whatever. In all these cases, if the mind be at rest, if the idea have a firm place in our consciousness, if we are sure of something, we say *I believe* it.

This assurance admits of degrees. The mind may be in a state not of absolute, but of relative, repose. This partial belief is so common in ordinary human affairs that we find it necessary, when we wish to assert absolute belief, to add some word indicating the completeness of our mental rest. We say, I believe it *with all my heart*, or something to this effect.

The word *believe* describes only a subjective state of mind, and makes no assertion about the objective truth or falsehood of that which we believe, about the reliability or the worthlessness of the grounds on which our confidence rests. *Belief* thus differs from

KNOWLEDGE. Whenever a man is sure of something, we say that he *believes* it. We say that he *knows* it, only when we assume that his belief is correct. Consequently, all knowledge is belief; for knowledge implies full assurance. But belief is knowledge only when it corresponds with reality.

It will be noticed that a man's mind may be in complete rest touching some one idea and in extreme unrest touching many others. Indeed, rest in one idea may cause unrest in others. A man may be compelled by indisputable evidence to believe that a great calamity has befallen him. In that idea his mind is at rest: for the idea has taken an immovable place in his thought. But his repose is that of despair, and awakens the unrest of terrible foreboding. "Even the dæmons *believe*, and shudder."

That which we believe, the thought in which our mind is at rest, may be called the OBJECT-MATTER of belief. Not unfrequently our belief has also a PERSONAL OBJECT. We then say not only *I believe it* but *I believe him.* This latter phrase implies that our assurance is derived from, and rests upon, the word of a speaker. The speaker is the personal object of our belief; the word spoken is its object-matter.

We now ask, when and why do the words of a speaker evoke belief in those who hear him? The answer is that we accept a man's words as true because in them his CHARACTER is involved. Either the speaker is false or his words are true, or will

come true, as the case may be. We weigh the alternative; and according to the probability on either side, we believe or doubt or disbelieve.

The elements of character in a speaker needful to evoke belief in a hearer vary according to the nature of the word spoken and believed. For belief of testimony touching the past and especially touching something which the witness declares that he has seen, we need proof of the speaker's intelligence and veracity; we need a witness who is not likely to be himself deceived or to deceive us. And in this case our demand for known intelligence and veracity will be in proportion to the unlikeliness of that which is asserted. But when a man makes a promise touching something which he will himself do, we need, for belief of his words, other elements of character. However intelligent and trustworthy he may be, his promise will not give us mental rest unless we have proof that he is able to perform it, and that he is not prone to change his mind. For full and intelligent assurance that the speaker will keep his word, we need evidence of his intelligence, veracity, ability, and constancy. Not unfrequently these elements of character are all present. And we then, with a rest of mind proportionate to our estimate of the speaker's character, look forward to a fulfilment of his promise In such a case we *believe* the man: for his words give us mental repose. And we *trust* him: for we lean, with all the interests at stake, upon his known character.

TRUST differs from *belief* in that it does not

necessarily imply a definite word accepted as true. But it always implies conscious leaning with interests at stake on some object, personal or otherwise, different from him who trusts in it. On the other hand we use the word *believe* of any object-matter which we accept as true, even though it bear so slightly upon our own interests as not to arouse any emotion within us or in any way to shape our conduct. When the speaker's word is a promise important to us, to accept it is both belief and trust.

In all belief in a person, especially in belief of a promise, there are three elements. (1) We estimate the speaker's character. This element is chiefly intellectual. Our judgment attests the trustworthiness of the foundation on which we are called to rest. (2) The entire man, with all the interests at stake, accepts and rests upon this judgment of the intelligence. This is the central element of faith or belief. (3) Then follows a confident expectation of fulfilment, or of consequences. The mind contemplates the contents, and the expected results or realisation, of the word or promise believed. In this last aspect, faith is a vision of the unseen. In all belief, in proportion to the bearing of the matter believed upon our own interests, and especially in belief of a definite promise, these three elements are present; but in different degrees. Sometimes our thoughts are directed chiefly to the trustworthiness of the speaker. At other times, when this is unquestionable, we think only of the meaning of his words and of the benefits involved in their fulfilment.

But in all cases the three elements are in some measure present.

The EFFECTS of belief are determined in part by its intensity and in part by its object-matter. By believing, we put ourselves under the influence of the word believed. Similarly, by opening our eyes we put ourselves under the influence of the object seen. Perhaps we read an event in the newspaper, and accept it as true. Our confidence is, in many such cases, both intelligent and complete. But sometimes, in consequence of the unimportance to us of the matter believed, our belief exerts upon us no appreciable influence. At other times, belief derived from the same source by the same mental process fills us with joy or sorrow, and shapes our entire future course. The difference is, not in the ground of belief or in the mental act, but in the bearing upon us of the matter believed.

To sum up. In modern thought and life, belief is mental rest in an idea. When belief has a personal object, this rest of mind is derived from, and rests upon, the word and character of a speaker. It is a VOLUNTARY SURRENDER OF THE WHOLE MAN TO BE INFLUENCED BY THAT WHICH HIS INTELLIGENCE, RIGHTLY OR WRONGLY, DECLARES TO BE TRUE. The practical effect of belief depends both upon the fulness of this surrender and upon the nature of the word believed.

The word *faith* differs somewhat in modern use from the word *believe* in that its use in the Bible gives to it a predominantly religious significance. But this difference is unknown to the sacred languages. It is also used in

English as in other languages to denote that element of character which inspires confidence in others. For this last sense we have also the cognate word *faithfulness.*

In the OLD TESTAMENT the word *believe* occurs frequently, and always represents one Hebrew word which has practically the same sense as its English equivalent. The simplest form (Kal) of the Hebrew word means to carry or support, as a nurse supports and carries an infant; another form (Niphal) means to be supported and thus made firm; and the form (Hiphil) rendered *believe* means literally to make firm, to treat as firm, to lean securely upon. Almost always the word has a personal object, and usually a definite word believed. So in Gen. xlv. 26, when Jacob's sons told him about Joseph, "he *believed* them not." Their words did not give him mental rest. In Exod. iv. 1, Moses says to God, "they will not *believe* me, nor hearken to my words." But God gave him (*v.* 4) miraculous attestation "that they may *believe* that Jehovah . . . has appeared to thee." Cp. *vv.* 8, 9; also *vv.* 30, 31, "Aaron spoke all the words which Jehovah had spoken to Moses, and did the signs in the sight of the people. And the people *believed.*" So Prov. xiv. 15, "the simple *believes* every word." Sometimes the term is used without any definite words spoken. So 1 Sam. xxvii. 12, "And Achish *believed* in David, saying, he has made his people utterly to abhor him; therefore he will be my servant for ever." But here evidently Achish's mind was at rest about David, and about his future action. Judges xi. 20

might be rendered "Sihon *believed* not Israel to pass through his border." And here we have (*v.* 19) definite words spoken to Sihon which are given more fully in Num. xxi. 22. But he did not believe them, and therefore refused Israel a passage. Throughout the Old Testament the Hebrew word has practically the same meaning as the English word *believe.*

In the Old Testament we find two modes of noting the personal object of belief; which may perhaps be rendered "give-credence *to*-him" and "put-faith *in*-him." The difference is only a single letter. Each of these forms is used both of God and of man as personal objects of faith. The latter is used only when belief conspicuously involves trust. So, after a great promise, we read in Gen. xv. 6 "Abraham *believed in* Jehovah."

The latter construction, *in him*, is constant with the word *trust* which is very common in the Old Testament. Specially frequent is the phrase *trust in God.* It differs from the word rendered *believe* in that it does not suggest a definite statement or promise believed, but denotes simply reliance upon some one or something other than ourselves.

The GREEK equivalents of our words *faith* and *believe* are derived from a verb meaning to *persuade.* Its use in classical Greek is well reproduced in the Greek Bible. And it agrees with that of its English equivalent, except that in the Greek word more than in the English is the idea of trust conspicuous. Cp. Wisdom xiv. 5, "men *trust* (literally *believe*) their lives to a ver small timber:" *i.e.* to a ship. So John ii. 24,

"Jesus did not *trust* Himself to them;" Luke xvi. 11, "who will *entrust* to you the true riches?" To the Jews (Rom. iii. 2) "were *entrusted* the oracles of God." To Paul was *entrusted* a stewardship, a proclamation, the Gospel: 1 Cor. ix. 17, Titus i. 3, 1 Tim. i. 11. In all these passages we have the common Greek word usually rendered *believe*. And in all cases, Greek or English, we have the same central conception, viz. the mind at rest in an idea. The voyager is persuaded and satisfied that the ship will bear him safely, and therefore trusts himself on board; others are persuaded that their goods are safe in the hand of another man, and therefore commit them to him.

Frequently we have a definite statement believed. So Luke i. 20, "thou didst not *believe* my words;" *v.* 45, "blessed is she that *believed*, because there shall be an accomplishment of that which has been spoken to her." In Acts xxvii. 25 we have both the personal object and the object-matter of belief: "I *believe* God that it will be, etc." But inasmuch as God and Christ are the well-known personal object of saving faith, and the good news announced by Christ its object-matter, these objects of faith are mentioned or left unmentioned as occasion may suggest. In Rom. iii. 22 we have "*belief* of Christ;" in ch. i. 16, 17, "all that *believe* . . . by *faith*, for *faith*;" in 2 Thess. ii. 13, "*belief* of the truth;" in Phil. i. 27, "*belief* of the Gospel."

Usually the word rendered *faith* denotes the mental state of one who believes. So in Matt. ix. 29, after asking "*believe* ye that I am able to do this?" Christ

adds "according to your *faith* be it done to you." But in Rom. iii. 3 "the *faith* of God" can only be His *faithfulness*. And the word has the same meaning probably in Gal. v. 22, Philem. 5, Titus ii. 10, Matt. xxiii. 23, Eph. i. 15.

In classical and Biblical Greek both the personal object and the object-matter are put in the DATIVE when following the verb *believe*, as though the speaker and the word spoken were the agent and instrument of belief; and in the GENITIVE when following the substantive *belief* or *faith*. This last construction occurs in Rom. iii. 22, 26, Gal. ii. 16, 20, etc. In the R.V. it is rendered "faith in Christ." But this rendering confounds two different constructions; and should be reserved for the Greek form used in Eph. i. 15, 1 Tim. iii. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 15, or for that in Rom. x. 14, Gal. ii. 16, Phil. i. 29, 1 Peter i. 21, and frequently in the Fourth Gospel. These are reproductions in Greek of the Hebrew phrase *believe in* noted above as involving the idea of trust.

Paul never suggests that he uses the words *believe* and *belief* in any other than their ordinary sense. And the same word is frequently used both for confidence reposed in God and for that reposed in man: so John v. 46, 47, 1 John v. 9, Exod. xiv. 31, 2 Chron. xx. 20. This suggests or implies that the mental act is the same in both cases except so far as it is modified by the difference between God and man, and between God's words and man's words. On the other hand, the contents and the authority of God's words rise so high

above that of any words spoken by man that they awaken in us a confidence in God far surpassing, in its complete repose and in its moral effects, any confidence we can place in man. This unique confidence in God is recognised in the English language, which has been formed under Christian influences, by the general reservation of the word *faith* for religious belief, a reservation unknown in Greek. But the mental process of belief is the same in both cases. The difference arises solely from the different object-matter and the infinitely different personal object of our faith.

In the fundamental doctrine of Rom. iii. 21, 22, the new and conspicuous feature is *faith*. Righteousness was already familiar to all Jews: but "righteousness through faith" was a new and startling announcement. This new element is illustrated and supported in the next chapter by an all-important comparison with the faith of Abraham. In Rom. iv. 3 Paul quotes, in a passage already referred to in Lect. XI. as illustrating the meaning of the phrase "righteousness through faith," the the famous words of Gen. xv. 6, "Abraham believed in Jehovah, and He counted it to him as righteousness." Here we have a definite promise spoken and believed, "So shall be thy seed," the object-matter of Abraham's faith; and we have its personal object, viz. God, who in that night spoke to Abraham these words of promise. Evidently, Abraham's belief, which God reckoned to him for righteousness, was an assurance that God's word will come true. "He believed . . . according to that which was spoken, So shall be thy seed:" Rom. iv. 18. The troubled

mind found rest: and the rest was wrought in him by God, through the instrumentality of the word spoken and believed. The word gave Abraham rest, even in spite of physical impossibility, because of the known power of Him who had promised. The process of faith is depicted in *vv.* 20, 21: "in view of the promise of God, he doubted not in unbelief, but was made strong by faith, giving glory to God and being fully persuaded that what He has promised He is able also to do." In other words, God gave to Abraham a great promise involving an event contrary to the ordinary course of nature. In this promise Abraham found rest because he knew that it came from Him who makes the dead to live and controls even things not yet existing.

Abraham's faith was rational; and its reasonableness is capable of logical statement. It was less unlikely that the ordinary course of nature should be set aside than that God should break His word. Intelligent faith is only a reasonable interpretation of the known facts of the case. Thus faith in God, so far from being opposed to reason, is itself attained by a process of legitimate reasoning.

We now turn again to Paul's fundamental doctrine that God receives into His favour and will enrich with immortal life all who believe the good news announced by Christ. This GOOD NEWS is the OBJECT-MATTER of justifying faith. Since it comes from God through the lips of Christ, GOD speaking to men IN CHRIST is the PERSONAL OBJECT of Christian faith. And, since the word believed involves a promise of that which no

human or natural authority or power can give, it is, like the faith of Abraham, a reliance, with the infinite interests at stake, upon the word and character of God.

Notice further that, if we believe this good news, *i.e.* if we accept it as true, we thereby fulfil the condition on which is suspended this promise of eternal life. Consequently, our belief of Paul's abstract statement touching those who believe the good news becomes a personal trust that God now receives into His favour us who believe and now gives us a life which will develop into the joy of heaven. And this abstract doctrine becomes, to those who intelligently believe it, an announcement of the present favour of God. This being so, the faith through which we obtain justification, as Paul understood it, is AN ASSURANCE, RESTING ON THE WORD AND PROMISE OF GOD, THAT GOD NOW RECEIVES INTO HIS FAVOUR AS HEIRS OF ETERNAL LIFE US WHO BELIEVE THE GOOD NEWS OF SALVATION ANNOUNCED BY CHRIST.

The faith which is the abiding condition of union with Christ and of all the inward blessings of the New Covenant will receive much fuller consideration in my next volume. Of this profounder rest in God, the faith just described is the commencement and the germ.

Such is Paul's doctrine of Justification through Faith. Indisputably it is the foundation-stone of the Epistle to the Romans. It is equally conspicuous in that to the Galatians; and underlies all his epistles, moulding his entire thought. It silenced in him the condemnation

of conscience, even in view of his previous hostility to the Gospel of Christ; and was to him the ground of exultant hope and the mainspring of a life of devotion to the highest interests of our race.

This good news Paul learnt from Christ, and believed on the authority of Christ. So Gal. i. 11, 12: "the good news announced by me, I did not receive from man . . . but by revelation of Jesus Christ." We ask at once, Did Paul correctly understand the teaching of Christ? Have we proof that the doctrine indisputably attributed by him to Christ came actually from the Master's lips? This is necessarily our next inquiry. We are encouraged in it by the evidence afforded by every page of his epistles of his penetrating intelligence, of his well-balanced judgment, of his moral worth. A doctrine held with unwavering confidence by so lofty a teacher demands at once our respectful attention. In this spirit we will inquire whether the great Apostle has correctly understood the teaching of Christ. We shall then ask whether we may accept the teaching of Christ as, in this all-important matter, absolutely true.

LECTURE XIII.

THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST.

OUR next inquiry is whether the doctrine of Justification through Faith, as expounded above, which we have traced to the pen and lips of Paul, or doctrine equivalent, was as matter of historical fact ACTUALLY TAUGHT BY CHRIST; whether the Apostle had correctly understood and reproduced the mind and purpose of Him whose ambassador he professed to be. We shall also ask to what extent the teaching of Christ as it passed through the active intelligence of Paul was moulded and coloured by his own thought and surroundings. Our task is to eliminate from the teaching of Paul the merely Pauline element, in order thus to reach the actual teaching of One Greater than the great Apostle.

This elimination is made easy by our possession, in the New Testament, of other very early Christian documents which are manifestly independent of the writings of Paul. To these we now turn.

The FOURTH GOSPEL and the First Epistle of John, which are evidently from the same pen, at once claim our attention. In the former we have an account of

the teaching of Christ, and in the latter a profound meditation on that teaching. Both documents were accepted in the latter part of the second century in all Churches without a shadow of doubt as written by the beloved Apostle John. This agreement proves that they were then very old and well known. It is exceedingly unlikely that the real author, who must have been a man of intellectual power, should fall utterly out of sight; and that another should, in the confident opinion of all Churches throughout the Roman Empire, be put into his place. This is made more unlikely by the late survival, as attested by unanimous tradition, of the Apostle John. This strong external testimony is confirmed by internal evidence. See further in Westcott's *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John*; also in Dissertation V. of my *Galatians.*

Turning now to these documents, we notice at once a complete difference in tone, in modes of thought, and in phraseology, from the Epistles of Paul. Righteousness through Faith, Justification through Faith, Faith reckoned for Righteousness, Reconciliation to God, meet us no more. Other phrases take their place. Evidently we have in the documents now before us an altogether independent and very early witness about the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth.

The substantive *faith* or *belief* is found in these documents only in 1 John v. 4. But in the Fourth Gospel the verb *believe* occurs more frequently than in all the Epistles of Paul. Our Lord is represented as teaching again and again that to believe is a unique

condition and channel of salvation. In the exposition of His teaching given to Nicodemus, as recorded in John iii. 15, 16, Christ declares with emphatic repetition that God "gave His Only-begotten Son in order that every one who believes in Him may not perish but may have eternal life." (Similarly John vi. 40.) Christ goes on to say that "He that believes in Him is not judged. But he that believes not is already judged because he has not believed." In John iii. 36, v. 24, vi. 47, Christ declares that he who believes in Him has eternal life, and is passed out of death into life. Similar teaching in ch. xi. 25, 26; and in 1 John v. 1, 5, 10, 13. In other words, the doctrine of eternal life as a privilege and present possession of all who believe in Christ is as conspicuous in the writings of John as is Justification through Faith in the writings of Paul.

These phrases, each a characteristic of a school of New Testament thought, are, from the point of view of spiritual life, absolutely equivalent. For Paul teaches that "the wages of sin is death," and that the unsaved are already dead through their sins; but that they who are saved by faith and whose sins are forgiven are already made alive in Christ: Rom. vi. 23, Eph. ii. 1, 5, Col. ii. 13, etc. This life, which all who believe already possess, and which will develop into the endless joys of heaven, is manifestly equivalent to the "eternal life" which Christ says that they have who believe in Him. Since death is the punishment of sin, "eternal life" involves pardon of sin. And in 1 John ii. 12 (cp. ch. i. 9) we find this as a present

possession, in close verbal agreement with Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, Acts xiii. 38. Moreover, since as we shall see Christ is the Judge of the world, to announce eternal life for all who believe is to announce Justification through Faith. Thus the teaching of Paul involves, and is involved in, the teaching attributed to Christ in the Fourth Gospel.

A close coincidence of thought under total difference of phraseology is found in John vi. 29 and Rom. iii. 27. To Jews who thought only of salvation by works, Christ said "This is the work of God, that ye believe in Him whom He has sent." And Paul, whose entire thought was moulded by the idea of law, describes the Gospel as "a law of faith." In each case, faith occupies a unique place as a condition of salvation.

We turn now to the SYNOPTIST GOSPELS. Of these, as already said, the First was accepted throughout the Roman world with complete confidence in the latter part of the second century as written by an Apostle, and the Second and Third as written by companions of Apostles. And in or before the middle of that century abundant quotations in the writings of Justin prove that the early Christians possessed the teaching of Christ in a form practically identical with that contained in the first three Gospels. The wide difference in phraseology and modes of thought between these and the Fourth Gospel assures us that we have in them another independent witness about the teaching of Christ.

In the FIRST GOSPEL, not faith but obedience to

the commands of Christ is the conspicuous condition of salvation. No one "will enter into the kingdom of Heaven" except "he that does the will of My Father in Heaven:" Matt. vii. 21. The prudent builder, whose house will stand, is he who hears and does the words of Jesus: *v.* 24. To an inquirer Christ says "if thou desirest to enter into life, keep the commandments:" ch. xix. 17.

We notice however that faith is frequently mentioned as a condition of blessing. To an afflicted woman whose faith had said "If I touch only His garment, I shall be saved," *i.e.* healed, Christ said "Thy faith has saved thee:" Matt. ix. 22. Two blind men who were craving His help, He asked whether they believed that He was able to heal them; and on receiving an affirmative reply said "according to your faith be it done to you." The disciples could not heal the demoniac boy because of their unbelief; whereas to those who have faith nothing will be impossible: ch. xvii. 20. Still more strongly in ch. xxi. 21: "verily I say to you, if ye have faith and doubt not, not only the matter of the fig tree ye shall do, but even if ye say to this mountain, Be taken away and cast into the sea, it will be done." Throughout the First Gospel faith is conspicuously a condition of spiritual power. In Mark i. 15 Christ opens His public ministry by bidding men to "repent and believe in the Gospel." In Luke viii. 12 "the devil comes and takes away the word from their hearts lest they should believe and be saved."

The forgiveness of sins, which we have already traced to the pen and lips of Paul, and which is involved in his doctrine of Justification through Faith, is conspicuous in the teaching of Christ as recorded in the Synoptist Gospels. He taught His disciples in the Lord's prayer to say "forgive us our debts." Faith is in Matt. ix. 2 connected with forgiveness of sins: and Christ asserts in *v.* 6 that "the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins." In ch. xii. 31, 32 He teaches that, with one exception, "all sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven to men." Similar testimony is found in the Second and Third Gospels. And in Mark i. 4, Luke iii. 3, this is said to be the aim of the preaching of the Baptist. Very conspicuous is the teaching of Christ at the institution of the Lord's Supper, as recorded in Matt. xxvi. 28, that His blood was being shed "for forgiveness of sins;" as is the announcement by the Risen Saviour, as recorded in Luke xxiv. 47, that "in His name forgiveness of sins" is "to be proclaimed to all the nations." These assertions imply that to obtain for men pardon of their sins was a chief aim of the mission and death of Christ.

In close harmony with the above we find PETER at Pentecost (Acts ii. 38) bidding his hearers to "repent and be baptized . . . for forgiveness of sins." In still closer agreement with the teaching of Paul, Peter says (Acts x. 43) to Cornelius "to Him all the prophets bear witness that through His name every one that believes in Him shall receive forgiveness of sins."

In 1 Peter i. 5, v. 9 faith is spoken of as a means of spiritual safety and stability. In ch. i. 9 we read that the end or goal of faith is salvation of souls; and in *v.* 7 that the trial or testing of our faith is more precious than that of gold. Of this testing of faith we read again in Jas. i. 3; and in *v.* 6 and ch. v. 15 we read that unwavering faith is a condition of successful prayer. The discussion about faith and works in Jas. ii. 14—26 reveals the unique importance of faith in early Christian teaching. Notice also the references to faith in *vv.* 1 and 5. In Jude 3 we have "the faith once committed to the saints;" and in *v.* 20 the readers' "most holy faith" is spoken of as a means of spiritual progress and stability. Through want of faith (*v.* 5) perished the Israelites in the wilderness.

Thus throughout the New Testament, except perhaps the Book of Revelation, which however contains nothing contradictory, we have, underlying broad diversity in diction and modes of thought, substantial harmony. Everywhere the teaching of Christ is spoken of as good news. And everywhere we find that an all-important element of this good news is forgiveness of sins for all who believe the words of Christ, or something equivalent.

We notice also that in the OLD TESTAMENT, although we have occasional references to forgiveness of sins, *e.g.* Ps. xxxii. 1, Isa. lv. 7, we have no clear announcement, like those in the writings of Paul and John, that God now receives into His favour all who

believe His words. But both forgiveness and purification were announced as elements of the New Covenant which in days to come God will make with men: Jer. xxxi. 34, Ezek. xxxvi. 25. Nor have we such teaching in any other pre-Christian literature. On the other hand, in all Christian literature of all Churches and all ages forgiveness of sins through faith has been conspicuous. It is a new and characteristic feature of the Gospel of Christ.

It is at once evident that this common element underlying the various types of thought in the New Testament must have had a common origin. And this can be no other than the ACTUAL TEACHING OF CHRIST. If, as matter of historical fact, He taught, as is frequently recorded in the Fourth Gospel, that God gave His Only-begotten Son in order that every one who believes in Him may have eternal life, and that they who believe in Him have passed out of death into life and have already eternal life, the teaching of the entire New Testament is explained. For this teaching implies forgiveness of sins through faith. And since, as we shall see, He claimed to be the future Judge of the world, these words of Christ are the judge's sentence in a criminal's favour. In other words, through faith even sinners are justified. Thus Paul's entire teaching about Justification through Faith is a logical development of teaching ascribed to Christ in the Fourth Gospel. It therefore confirms the truthfulness of the account there given of the actual teaching of Christ. The deep underlying

harmony of Paul and John leaves no room for doubt that each of them interpreted correctly the thought of the Great Teacher. And this strong presumption is confirmed by important coincidences in the Synoptist Gospels.

On the other hand, if Christ did not preach the doctrine attributed to Him by Paul and in the Fourth Gospel, we are compelled to believe that all the early Christian records and all the early preachers of the Gospel were in serious and fundamental error about the teaching of Christ. Yet these men gained for Him the homage of all succeeding ages; and, as we have seen, their teaching turned back from ruin the whole course of human history and saved the world. The impossibility of supposing that these successful teachers were in serious error touching the chief matter of their teaching is complete proof that the doctrine expounded above was actually taught by Christ. In other words, the only possible explanation of all the facts of the case is that, as matter of historical fact, Jesus of Nazareth taught that GOD RECEIVES INTO HIS FAVOUR, in spite of their past sins, ALL WHO BELIEVE THE GOOD NEWS ANNOUNCED BY CHRIST. This is an assured result of our theological research.

It will be noticed that this result is independent of any special authority of Holy Scripture. We have not even assumed that the New Testament is a correct record of the teaching of Christ; but we have tested its statements as we should any other documentary

evidence. And, just as frequently in our courts of law the agreement of fallible witnesses under circumstances in which agreement in error is impossible leaves no room for doubt that their testimony is true, so the deep underlying harmony of the various types of teaching in the New Testament assures us that the element common to all, expounded above, was actually taught by Christ.

The above argument does not assume even that the Fourth Gospel was written by the Apostle John; although it is strengthened by the evidences of authorship noticed above. For indisputably that Gospel cannot be much later than the early part of the second century. And its total difference in thought and diction from the Epistles of Paul reveals its independent origin. It is therefore, as are the Synoptist Gospels, an independent witness about the teaching of Christ.

LECTURE XIV.

FAITH AND WORKS.

IN Lect. VII. we have seen that each of the Four Gospels represents Christ as teaching, plainly and conspicuously and frequently, that God frowns on all sin and smiles only on THOSE WHO OBEY His commands; and that this teaching was re-echoed, with equal plainness and emphasis and frequency, by Paul. On the other hand, we have seen that both Christ and Paul taught, in plainest and most emphatic language, that God receives into His favour as heirs of eternal blessedness ALL those WHO BELIEVE the good news announced by Christ. The apparent contradiction involved in these statements demands now our best attention.

The emphatic and repeated teaching of the various writers of the New Testament forbids us to accept as satisfactory any solution which does not maintain each statement in its full force. Moreover, the former statement is demanded by the supreme majesty of the Moral Law which will tolerate no infringement of its rights. On the other hand, nothing less than the full pardon involved in the latter statement will supply the

deep need of guilty and helpless humanity. For the harmony underlying the claims of justice and the word of mercy, we now seek.

The harmony will be found in the object-matter of saving faith, *i.e.* in the nature of the good news which, as a condition of His favour, God requires us to believe. This object-matter of faith is, as we have already seen, not a mere statement about God but an announcement of what God will do for those who believe. In other words, saving faith is a belief, not of a doctrine, but of a wonderful promise. In this truth we shall find the solution we require.

The moral teaching of Christ compels us to believe that God smiles only on those who obey His commands. This being so, it is psychologically impossible for us to believe that God receives us into His favour until we are ready to FORSAKE SIN ; or to believe that God smiles upon us while we are content to continue in sin. For, manifestly, no one can be saved against his will. In other words, the Law which says, with an authority we cannot question, "the soul which sins will die," makes saving faith impossible except to those who are willing to give up sin. Moreover, a sad experience has revealed to us our utter inability to render the obedience which God requires. Consequently the promise that God will receive into His favour all who believe the Gospel involves a promise that He will work in them the obedience He requires. And justifying faith becomes an assurance not only that God now receives into His favour us who believe the good news of salvation

but also that from the moment we believe He will GIVE US POWER TO CONQUER SIN. It is also evident that we cannot continue to exercise saving faith unless we actually turn from sin. For we cannot believe that God smiles on us while we do that on which He frowns.

In another volume I hope to show that Christ claims the active and unreserved devotion of all whom He rescues from the penalty of their past sins. To those who know this, belief of the good news announced by Christ involves readiness to yield to Him the homage He demands. This homage involves abandonment of all sin.

We now see that the moral teaching of Christ, re-echoed by the law written on the hearts of all men, guards from perversion the Gospel of Christ, by making faith, which is a condition of salvation, impossible except to those who purpose to forsake sin, and abiding faith impossible except to those who actually conquer sin. In other words the moral law compels those who love sin to disbelieve the promise of God, and thus keeps them outside the number of those for whom the Gospel announces salvation. It closes every gate to forgiveness except that which leads away from all sin.

In Lect. XI. we have seen that the fundamental Gospel of Paul is expressed in the phrase, "a man is justified by faith apart from works of law." So Rom. iii. 28, 30, Gal. ii. 16 twice. On the other hand, in Rom. ii. 13 he writes, "not the hearers of law are righteous with God; but the doers of law will be

justified." In close harmony with this last passage, we read in Matt. xii. 37, after a reference to the day of judgment, "by thy words thou wilt be justified and by thy words thou wilt be condemned." Similarly, James ii. 21: "was not Abraham justified by works when he offered Isaac his son upon the altar?" We have here a present and preliminary justification through faith and a final justification by works.

These TWO JUSTIFICATIONS are in complete harmony, and are closely connected. The present justification by faith would be worthless were it not a genuine anticipation of the final award of the great Judge. And this final approbation is conditional (cp. Rom. ii. 7) upon continuance in good works. Moreover, as I hope to show in another volume, through faith we obtain not only the present favour of God but also power to walk in the path of obedience. In other words, the two justifications represent the two lines of teaching now before us.

In the New Testament these two lines of teaching, the safeguard and the doctrine to be guarded, are most closely interwoven, especially by Paul. After stating, in Rom. i. 16, 17, his fundamental doctrine of righteousness through faith, he adds in ch. ii. 2-13 the moral safeguard just noted, before he proceeds to expound at full, in ch. iii. 21—iv. 25, his central doctrine. Similarly, after asserting and defending the same doctrine in Gal. ii. 16—v. 12, he adds in ch. v. 13—vi. 10 an assertion of inevitable and exact moral retribution. And the conspicuously evangelical teaching of

the Fourth Gospel receives its moral counterpart, not only in the conspicuous moral teaching of the First Gospel, but in the plain and strong teaching of 1 John ii. 29—iii. 10.

Already, in Lect. X., we have seen that both Christ and Paul assume that all men have sinned and are now, unless saved by Christ, treading a path of sin. And we have now inferred from God's anger against sin that none enjoy His favour except those who turn from sin and serve God. This turning from sin to serve God is in the R.V. of Ps. li. 13, Acts xv. 3, James v. 19, 20 described as CONVERSION or *being-converted.* And the words so rendered are frequently used as a condition of salvation. So Isa. lv. 7: "Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him *return* to the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon." And Jer. iii. 12, 22, iv. 1, xviii. 11, xxiv. 7, xxxv. 15, xxxvi. 3, 7, and elsewhere frequently. Also Matt. xiii. 15, "lest they should *turn-again* and I should heal them;" Acts iii. 19, ix. 35, xi. 21, xiv. 15, xv. 19, xxvi. 18, 20, where we have the phrases, repent and *turn-again*, *turn* from these vain things to God, *turn* them from darkness to light. So 1 Thess. i. 9, "how ye *turned* to God from idols, to serve a living and true God;" also 1 Peter ii. 25. In Gal. iv. 9 we have a retrograde turning to the weak and poor elements of the world.

Closely connected with the word rendered *turn-again* or *convert*, and with forgiveness of sins, we find in

Acts iii. 19, xxvi. 20, and in Mark i. 4, Luke iii. 3, xxiv. 47, Acts v. 31 a Greek word always rendered REPENT. It is connected with faith in Mark i. 15, "*repent* and believe in the Gospel," and in Acts xx. 21; and is conspicuously a condition of salvation in Luke xiii. 3, 5, "except ye *repent*, ye shall all in like manner perish." This word now demands attention.

According to its form, the Greek word so rendered denotes an afterthought or change of mind; and in this sense it is occasionally used in classical Greek, and by the LXX. So in 1 Sam. xv. 29 in reference to God, "He will not turn nor *repent*, because He is not a man that He should *repent*;" and in Jer. iv. 28, "I have spoken and I will not *repent*, I have sworn and I will not turn away from it." On the other hand we read in Jer. xviii. 8, "If that nation concerning which I have spoken turn from their evil, I will *repent* of the evil which I thought to do to them:" so *v.* 10, "I will *repent* of the good wherewith I said that I would benefit them." Almost the same words in Jonah iii. 10, iv. 2: cp. Joel ii. 13, 14. The apparent contradiction is easily explained. Since all God's purposes are good, He cannot change them. Change of purpose is human, not divine. But in order to assert, in strongest possible language, that God's treatment of men is conditioned by their own action, Jeremiah represents God as saying that if men will turn from sin He will turn from His purpose to punish them.

The same word denotes in Wisdom xi. 24, xii. 10, 19, Sirach xliv. 16 a moral change of mind. And in this

sense it is used in Matt. iii. 2, Mark vi. 12, Luke xiii. 3, 5, xv. 7, 10, Acts ii. 38, iii. 19, xvii. 30, Rom. ii. 4, without further specification as itself conveying an idea sufficiently definite. In Acts viii. 22, Heb. vi. 1, Rev. ii. 21, 22, ix. 20, 21, xvi. 11 we have the sins from which, (or in 2 Cor. xii. 21 the sins about which,) men did or did not mentally turn away. Elsewhere we have the aim of repentance. So Matt. xii. 41, Luke xi. 32, "to the preaching of Jonah," *i.e.* to do as he bid them; Acts xi. 18, "repentance to life;" ch. xx. 21, "towards God;" 2 Cor. vii. 10, "repentance for salvation;" and 2 Tim. ii. 25, "for knowledge of the truth."

Inasmuch as the word rendered *repent* denotes etymologically a change of mind and this meaning satisfies its use wherever found, whereas the word rendered *turn-again* or *return* or *be-converted* denotes merely a turning round towards some definite object, it is best to understand this last word as including the entire change inward and outward which God requires, and the word *repent* as denoting only the inward turning to God. If so, we may define REPENTANCE, as used in the New Testament, to be A SINNER'S PURPOSE TO FORSAKE SIN AND SERVE GOD.

That repentance, thus understood, is a condition of salvation, is asserted or implied in the passages quoted above. And, even apart from these passages, the absolute necessity of repentance for salvation is implied in the entire moral teaching of the Bible. For if, as we are compelled to believe, God smiles only on those who do right, and if, as Paul assumes and our hearts re-echo,

apart from Christ all men are pursuing a wrong path, the present favour of God can be obtained only by those who deliberately resolve to forsake sin and henceforth obey God. Indeed, without such resolve the law written on the heart forbids us to believe that we possess His favour. For it is psychologically impossible to believe that God smiles on us while we are treading a path which He forbids. Consequently, without repentance there can be no genuine faith, and therefore no justification. In other words, repentance is not another condition of salvation in addition to faith, but is already implied in the condition of faith. This explains the important position of repentance in the passages quoted above as an essential condition of salvation, and the still more frequent mention of faith as the one condition.

In Rom. ii. 4 Paul blames a supposed objecter for not knowing that God is leading him to *repentance.* Yet in spite of this divine leading the man in question has still (*v.* 5) an "*impenitent* heart." This evidently means, according to Greek idiom, that God is exerting upon him a real influence tending to repentance, but that in consequence of his resistance to it the influence is without result. This general statement and the appeal based upon it imply that upon all men God is exerting this influence. For if there were an exception it might be the man to whom Paul speaks. Moreover, that apart from such divine influence repentance is impossible, Christ teaches in John vi. 44: "no one can come to me except the Father . . . draw

him." So *v.* 65 : "no one can come to me except it be given to him from the Father." According to this teaching, repentance is a work and gift of God. So 2 Tim. ii. 25, "if peradventure God may give them repentance." Similarly Acts v. 31, "to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins;" and ch. xi. 18, "to the Gentiles God has given repentance to life."

All this implies that upon all men God is exerting an influence prompting them to resolve to forsake sin and henceforth to serve God; that apart from this divine influence none will or can even in heart turn to God; but that the actual effect of this influence depends upon man's self-surrender to it. In other words, repentance is God's work in man: but impenitence is altogether a result of man's resistance to divine persuasion.

In close harmony with the above, Paul writes in Phil. i. 6 "He who has begun in you a good work will complete it;" and in ch. ii. 13, "it is God who works in you to will and to do for His good pleasure." And the teaching of the entire New Testament asserts or assumes that, from the earliest desire for better things to final victory over the last enemy, salvation is entirely a gift and work of God, a result of divine influences brought to bear on man and in man and on all men; but that the actual effect of these influences depends entirely on man's free surrender to them.

In another volume I hope to show that salvation in all its stages is an accomplishment of a deliberate and eternal purpose of God.

It is now evident that the announcement of forgiveness which we have traced to the lips of Christ does not conflict with the demands of the Moral Law. In our next volume we shall find that this announcement aids the fulfilment of the commands of the Law in a way so remarkable as to reveal the common source of the Law and the Gospel

LECTURE XV.

RESULTS ATTAINED.

WE will now review for a moment the results attained up to this point.

In the visible universe we found clear indications that beyond and above it is an unseen and intelligent Creator and Ruler. And in the moral intuitions of men we found a premonition that He will recompense all men according to their works. The inadequacy of the retribution observed in the present life convinced us that there will be a complete recompense beyond the grave.

These inferences from our own observation were confirmed, and indeed raised to absolute certainty, by the express and emphatic teaching of One whose influence, as revealed in the present condition and the past history of our race, turned back the whole course of human life and history from ruin to sustained progress, and whose recorded teaching claimed irresistibly the homage of whatever in us is noblest and best.

All this evoked in us a consciousness of personal sin and a fear of punishment beyond the grave. This fear of punishment aroused efforts after amendment, in the

hope, which however seemed to us doubtful, that by future obedience we might atone for past sins. These efforts failed utterly; and by their failure revealed to us a moral bondage which compels us, unless delivered by One mightier than ourselves, to continue in our former path of sin. Thus our theological research created in us a deep spiritual need,—viz., of deliverance from the penalty of past sin and from the present bondage of sin.

This deep need, the moral teaching of Christ, which at once claimed our moral homage, does little to supply. For the Moral Law, even as spoken by Christ, says nothing about the pardon of past sin or about deliverance from the present power of sin. And the supreme example of Christ does but make us feel how far and how foully we have fallen. The only ray of hope in this teaching is the manifest goodness and kindness of the Teacher. To Him therefore we turned again to hear whether He had for us any good tidings of salvation.

In the various books of the New Testament we found other elements of teaching quite different from, yet intimately connected with, the moral teaching of Christ. We found, by strictly historical methods that, as matter of indisputable fact, Paul taught, in forms peculiar to himself, that God receives into His favour all who believe the good news announced by Christ. And a close essential agreement underlying the very different phraseology of the various documents of the New Testament left no room for doubt that this remarkable

doctrine came from the lips of the great Teacher whose religious influence has saved the world. This is at once a very strong presumption that this teaching is true. For it is in the last degree unlikely that the most distinctive teaching of so successful a Teacher should be error.

This combined evidence is sufficient for reasonable certainty. But, as we shall see in PART V., it is by no means the whole proof, or the most convincing proof, that the doctrine which we have traced to the lips of Jesus of Nazareth is in very truth the voice and word of God. In the course of our further research we shall find evidence which will compel us to believe that Jesus claimed to be, and convinced all His early followers that He is, the Eternal Son of God; that they gave to Him with perfect confidence this august dignity because they believed that He had risen from the dead. And in this belief, viewed in the light of its circumstances and of its effect upon the world, we shall find evidence compelling conviction that the Apostles' belief was correct, that Christ actually rose from the dead, and that in very truth He is what He claimed to be. This proof of the supreme dignity of Christ will give to the pardon indisputably proclaimed by Him absolute authority. But this further evidence I must for the present postpone.

Meanwhile a difficulty confronts us for which we must at once seek a solution from the ancient teachers in whose writings we have read the Gospel of Christ. The remission of the penalty of past sins seems to

trample under foot the majesty of the Law which declares the inevitable sequence of sin and punishment, a sequence which has its deep root in the foundation of human thought and life. We feel instinctively that whatever weakens or seems to weaken this sequence is ruinous to the highest interests of man. In human rule, to pardon the guilty is to injure the innocent. And it is expressly forbidden in the Bible. "He that justifies a bad man and he that condemns a righteous man, an abomination to Jehovah are they both:" Prov. xvii. 15. What God forbids to others, Paul declares (Rom. iv. 5) that He Himself does: He "justifies the ungodly." We ask whether Paul recognises, and how he deals with, this great difficulty,—viz. the invasion of the rights of eternal justice involved in the forgiveness of sins. We shall find that this difficulty will be removed, in whole or in part, by another conspicuous element of New Testament teaching. This second fundamental doctrine of the Gospel will occupy the next division of this work.

PART III.

THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

LECTURE XVI.

THE TEACHING OF PAUL.

ANOTHER important element of New Testament teaching, closely associated in the thought of Paul with his great doctrine of Justification through Faith, now demands attention. It will do something to lessen the moral difficulty involved in the pardon of the guilty proclaimed by Christ and His Apostles.

After the announcement in Rom. iii. 21, 22 of "righteousness . . . through belief of Christ for all who believe," Paul adds in *v.* 24 that they are "justified . . . through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus." This "redemption in Christ" is further expounded by the assertion "whom God set forth as a propitiation through faith, in His blood." These last words point to the VIOLENT DEATH OF CHRIST as a conspicuous element in the redemption wrought out for men in Him. The ultimate purpose of this mysterious act of God is

added—viz. "for a proof of His righteousness . . . in order that He may be Himself righteous and a justifier of him who has belief of Jesus." In other words, God gave Christ to die in order to harmonise with His own righteousness the justification of believers.

The same teaching appears again very conspicuously in Rom. v. 6-10 as the basis of an argument and as a ground of Christian hope. "Christ died (*v.* 6) on behalf of ungodly ones" and (*v.* 8) "on our behalf;" we were (*v.* 9) "justified in His blood" and (*v.* 10) were "reconciled to God through the death of His Son." In ch. vi. 3 we read that "so many as were baptized for Christ were baptized for His death;" and in *v.* 6 "your old man has been crucified with Him." Other references to the death of Christ are found in ch. viii. 34, xiv. 9, 15. All this implies that the death of Christ on the cross is an essential link in the chain of man's salvation.

In 1 Cor. i. 17 Paul avoids "wisdom of word lest the cross of Christ be made vain," implying clearly that the death of Christ was designed to be fruitful of results. Consequently, the Gospel is described in *v.* 18 as "the word of the cross." In *v.* 23 Paul preaches "Christ crucified," and determines (ch. ii. 2) to know nothing else. So ch. v. 7, "Christ our passover has been sacrificed," points to the death of Christ as the means of salvation: for the paschal lamb saved the firstborn by its own death. The remarkable phrase "partnership in the blood of Christ" in ch. x. 16 can only mean that we are sharers of benefits derived therefrom. In an

opposite sense the same words might be applied to those who had joined in His murder. Equally conspicuous are the words of Christ quoted in ch. xi. 25, "this cup is the New Covenant in My blood." These words teach clearly that God was about to enter into a new engagement with man, and that this engagement was intimately connected with the approaching violent death of Christ.

In Gal. iii. 13 we read that "Christ has bought us off from the curse of the Law, having become a curse on our behalf;" and these last words are at once explained by the curse attaching to crucifixion. In ch. vi. 12 certain false teachers wish to avoid persecution on account of the cross of Christ. This implies that the persecution they feared was occasioned by teaching about the death of Christ. And this suggestion is abundantly confirmed by Paul's exultant assertion in *v.* 14 that through the cross of Christ he has himself been crucified to the world and the world to him. This implies most clearly that the death of Christ upon the cross was in some real sense a means of man's salvation.

Equally clear is Eph. i. 7, "we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of trespasses;" ch. ii. 13, "ye have been brought near in the blood of Christ;" and *v.* 16, "that He might reconcile both . . . to God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Similarly Col. i. 20, "having made peace through the blood of His cross;" *v.* 22, "but now He has reconciled you in the body of His flesh

through death;" ch. ii. 14, "He took out of the way the handwriting which was against us, having nailed it to the cross."

In Rom. iv. 25, viii. 32, Gal. i. 4, ii. 20, Eph. v. 25, 1 Tim. ii. 6, Titus ii. 14 we read that Christ was given up, or gave Himself up, to save man. This phrase is explained in Gal. ii. 21 by the added words "for if righteousness be through law, then has Christ died to no purpose." Evidently in the passages quoted above Paul refers to Christ's surrender, by Himself and by the Father, to death.

All this implies or asserts, in plainest language, that man's salvation comes THROUGH THE DEATH OF CHRIST. And it reveals the broad and deep hold of this doctrine upon the mind and thought of Paul. No theory of the origin of Christianity is satisfactory which does not take into account this conspicuous element in the teaching of the most conspicuous of the early preachers of the Gospel.

It is equally certain that Paul taught that, not only have blessings and salvation resulted from the death of Christ, but that for this end He knowingly and willingly laid down His life. In other words, Paul taught that Christ's death was no mere calamity from which good has actually come, but that it was an accomplishment of a DELIBERATE PURPOSE of Himself and of God. This is suggested by the passages quoted above where Christ is said to have died on our behalf, *i.e.* for our benefit. And it is expressly asserted in Rom. xiv. 9, "for this end Christ died and

lived, in order that both of dead and living He might be lord." So 2 Cor. v. 15, "on behalf of all He died, in order that they who live may live no longer for themselves but for Him who on their behalf died and rose;" Gal. i. 4, "who gave Himself that He might rescue us from the present evil age;" Eph. v. 25, "He gave up Himself on behalf of the Church in order that He might sanctify it;" Titus ii. 14, "who gave Himself that He might redeem us from all lawlessness." This definite purpose of the death of Christ separates it completely from the heroic deaths of martyrs. From Rom. iii. 25, "whom God set forth . . . in His own blood," we learn that the death of Christ was a deliberate purpose of the Father. And this is implied in ch. viii. 32, "He gave Him for us all."

We now ask, wherein lay the need for so costly a means of salvation? Why could not God save men from death apart from the death of Christ? It is at once evident that if a less costly means had been sufficient God would not have given up His Son to die. The greatness of the sacrifice proclaims the greatness of the necessity which demanded it.

A partial answer to our question is ready. Paul teaches that the need for the death of Christ in order to man's salvation lay in man's SIN. He "was given up because of our trespasses," Rom. iv. 25; "Christ died for our sins," 1 Cor. xv. 3; "He gave Himself for our sins," Gal. i. 4. In other words, man's sin, which made impossible justification by works, made

needful for justification through faith the death of Christ. This need will require examination. But already we have found that Paul taught that our salvation comes through the death of Christ, that for this end and of His own accord and by the will of God He deliberately laid down His life, and that the need for this costly means of salvation lay in man's sin.

LECTURE XVII.

REDEMPTION AND PROPITIATION.

AFTER asserting in Rom. iii. 21, 22 that in the Gospel has been manifested a righteousness of God for all that believe, Paul goes on in *v.* 24 to add that we "are justified freely by His grace through the *redemption* which is in Christ Jesus." The teaching involved in the word REDEMPTION demands now our careful study.

The same word is used in Dan. iv. 32 (LXX.) for Nebuchadnezzar's restoration; and in Rom. viii. 23, 1 Cor. i. 30, Eph. i. 7, 14, iv. 30, Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15, xi. 35, Luke xxi. 28. The corresponding verb is found in (LXX.) Exod. xxi. 8, "he shall let her go-free-for-a-ransom;" and in Zeph. iii. 1; but not in the New Testament. A cognate and simpler substantive is used in Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, "to give His life a *ransom* for many;" in Prov. xiii. 8, "a man's own wealth is the *ransom* of his life," *i.e.* money may save a man from death; and in Prov. vi. 35, "he will not give up his enmity for any ransom," *i.e.* no payment of money will pacify an injured husband. The corresponding verb is common

in the LXX. in reference to something on which the Mosaic Law had a claim, but which was released for a price or substitute. So Ex. xiii. 13, "I sacrifice every firstborn male to the Lord, and every firstborn of my sons I will *ransom*." The word may be studied in Lev. xxv. 25, 30, 33, 48, 49, 54, xxvii. 13-33, Num. xviii. 15, 16. It is also common in classical Greek for the liberation of captives by a price paid. In a looser sense, the same word is used in Deut. vii. 8, "The Lord brought you out with a strong hand, and the Lord *ransomed* thee from the house of bondage;" also Deut. ix. 26, xiii. 5, xv. 15, xxi. 8, xxiv. 18, 2 Sam. vii. 23, 1 Chron. xvii. 21, Neh. i. 10. In all these places the idea of rescue is conspicuous; and in those last quoted it obscures that of price. So David says, in 2 Sam. iv. 9, "The Lord . . . has *ransomed* my soul from all affliction." In the other passages the idea of price is equally conspicuous. Usually, to *ransom* is to liberate by payment of a price.

This family of words, with these associations of thought, Paul uses to describe the deliverance of sinners from the penalty due to their sins and from the moral bondage of sin. To the passages quoted above, I may add 1 Tim. ii. 6, "who gave Himself a *ransom* for all;" and Titus ii. 14, "who gave Himself for us, that He may *ransom* us from all lawlessness." Also 1 Peter i. 18, 19, "*ransomed* not with silver or gold . . . but with precious blood, even that of Christ."

The same idea of purchase finds expression in an altogether different word, used in 1 Cor. vi. 20, "ye are not your own: for ye were *bought* with a price;" in ch. vii. 23, "ye were *bought* with a price: become not servants of men;" also in Gal. iii. 13, where after proving that all are under a curse Paul adds, "Christ has *bought* us *off* from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us;" and in ch. iv. 5, "God sent forth His Son . . . that He might *buy off* those that are under law."

We now ask, In what sense does Paul assert in Rom. iii. 24 that there is "*redemption* in Christ Jesus?" Wherever the word and its cognates are found, as we may learn from the above references, we have the idea of LIBERATION. And in the passage before us this idea is already suggested by the word *justified*: for the justification of men who "have all sinned" involves their liberation from the due penalty of their sins. That this liberation is brought about by the violent death of Christ on the cross, is implied in the conspicuous words *in His blood* in *v.* 25. And this is expressly asserted in several passages quoted above. In *v.* 26 Paul adds that the purpose for which "God set forth" Christ "in His blood" was (see my next lecture) to harmonise with His own justice the justification of those that believe in Christ. If so, Christ's death was absolutely needful for our salvation: for God cannot possibly be unjust. And, if so, it was, in the full sense of the word, the redemption-PRICE of our salvation.

This exposition relieves us from the difficulty of saying to whom was paid the ransom-price of our salvation. It was paid to no one. The phraseology before us is a metaphorical and expressive mode of asserting the costliness (cp. 1 Peter i. 18, 19) of our liberation and the absolute necessity of the death of Christ for our salvation. The metaphor underlying this phraseology is one of the most frequent in human language and thought. Whatever is obtained with difficulty, with effort or toil or pain, we speak of as costing this effort or toil or pain, even when no one receives the price we pay. As the costly means absolutely needful for man's salvation, the various writers of the New Testament speak of the death of Christ as a ransom for men.

This metaphor implies that Christ died in our stead. For the ransom takes conspicuously the place of the captives set free.

We may now describe the use of this family of words in the New Testament by saying that EVANGELICAL REDEMPTION is THE DELIVERANCE OF SINNERS FROM THE PENALTY AND POWER OF SIN BY THE COSTLY MEANS OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST. To the above examples, I may add Luke i. 68, ii. 38, xxiv. 21, Acts vii. 35, Heb. ix. 12. No account of the theological significance of the death of Christ is satisfactory which fails to account for, and to justify, this important element of the teaching of the New Testament.

We now pass from Rom. iii. 24 where Paul speaks

of "the redemption in Christ Jesus" to *v.* 25 where he adds "whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith, in His blood." The new idea here introduced, viz. PROPITIATION, is placed in conspicuous connection with Christ's violent death upon the cross, by the words *in His blood.* A cognate word is found in 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10; and another cognate in Heb. ii. 17: in each case a propitiation for sin. Similarly Luke xviii. 13: "become *propitious* to me, the sinner."

The verb in Heb. ii. 17, *make-propitiation*, is very common in the LXX., *e.g.* Lev. iv. 20, 26, 31, 35, v. 6, 10, 13, 18: "the priest shall make *propitiation* for him, for the sin which he sinned, and the sin shall be forgiven him." It was evidently a technical sacrificial term. The words "in His blood" added in Rom. iii. 25 to expound "propitiation through faith" remind us that blood and the sprinkling of blood were a conspicuous feature of the Levitical propitiatory sacrifices. This family of words, usually in R.V. rendered "atonement," is very common in the LXX., and is not uncommon in the Apocrypha, always, except when used as in Heb. ix. 5 to denote the *mercy-seat*, in the sense of escape from the punishment due to sin. So Sirach iii. 3, "he who honours his father will *propitiate* sins;" and *v.* 30, "mercy will *propitiate* sins."

The phrase *propitiate God* in the sense of deprecate the anger and regain the favour of an offended deity is common in classical Greek. So Homer, *Iliad* bk. i. 147, "in order to *propitiate* for us the Far-darter by performing sacred rites;" similarly lines 386, 444,

472. In each of these cases the name of the deity whose anger is turned aside is put in an accusative case governed directly by the verb *propitiate.* But this construction is found, in reference to God, only once (Zech. vii. 2) in the LXX., and then as a solitary rendering of an altogether different Hebrew word. Similarly Jacob says of Esau in Gen. xxxii. 20, "I will *propitiate* his face with the gifts:" and Prov. xvi. 14, "A king's anger is a messenger of death; but a wise man will *propitiate* it." Sometimes we read, as in Heb. ii. 17, to "*propitiate* sins," at other times to "*propitiate* the sanctuary" as in Lev. xvi. 20, 33, but usually to "make *propitiation* for sin." We never read of a sacrifice offered to propitiate God.

This grammatical distinction, so remarkably maintained, notes an important difference between the Biblical and pagan conceptions of God. The Greeks looked upon their gods as needing to be appeased, as one man endeavours to turn away the anger of another. The change needed was in the mind of the god, who is therefore the direct object of the verb *propitiate.* But both ancient Israel and the Apostles of Christ knew that God's anger is not a vexation with an individual which needs to be changed, but an unchangeable opposition to sin. From that anger the sinner needs to find escape. But the propitiation he needs is not one which will change God's anger against sin, but one which will SHELTER THE SINNER FROM THE PUNISHMENT DUE TO HIS SIN. And this we may accept as a definition of EVANGELICAL PROPITIATION.

In Rom. iii. 25 Paul asserts that *God set forth* Christ, i.e. placed Him conspicuously before the eyes of men, covered with *His own blood*, to be a *propitiation*, i.e. a means of sheltering sinners from the penalty due to their sins. This implies that God gave Christ to die in order to remove a barrier erected by man's sin and shutting out from the sinner the smile of God. And he adds that, as already expounded in PART II., this propitiation is "through faith." In other words, as each one ventures to believe the good news announced by Christ, the propitiation becomes valid for him, and upon him bursts forth the smile of a pardoning God.

The examples quoted above from Lev. iv. and v. show that the word *propitiate* is a technical term in connection with the bloody sacrifices commanded in the Law of Moses. Its use by Paul and by other writers of the New Testament places the death of Christ in relation to that of the animals slain in the ancient ritual. In close harmony with this, we read in 1 Cor. v. 7, "our passover has been sacrificed, even Christ." And Paul's constant teaching that the death of Christ was absolutely needful for man's salvation suggests an explanation of the animal sacrifices of the Old Covenant. For if, as Paul taught, God gave Christ to die in order to save men from the penalty of their own sins, we wonder not that in earlier ages He required as a means of man's approach to God the death of innocent animals in order by the manifest insufficiency of such sacrifices to suggest the need of more precious blood than that of sheep and goats. Thus the teaching

of the New Testament explains in some measure the ancient sacrifices.

This Lecture has not answered the question suggested at the close of Lect. XVI. It has merely confirmed the results therein attained by an exposition of two phrases used in the New Testament to describe the relation of the Death of Christ to man's salvation. We still inquire wherein lay the need for this costly redemption and for this propitiation in the death of Christ.

LECTURE XVIII.

THE JUSTICE OF GOD.

WE have now found abundant proof that as matter of fact Paul taught that the Justification announced by Christ, which each one appropriates by personal faith, comes to men through the death of Christ upon the cross; that for this end, at the bidding of God, Christ voluntarily laid down His life; and that the need for this tremendous means of salvation lay in man's sin. We have also found that Paul spoke of Christ's death as the ransom-price of man's salvation, thus suggesting the extreme costliness of the salvation announced by Christ and the absolute necessity of the death of Christ as the one means of salvation; and as a propitiation for sin, thus linking His death with that of the animals slain in sacrifice under the Old Covenant.

All this implies clearly that apart from the death of Christ salvation was impossible for man, that only through His death could the fetters of moral bondage be broken and only thus could man escape from the anger of God against sin.

In PART IV. we shall find proof that Paul believed

that He who died on the cross is the own and only Son of God, the eternal Companion of His glory, the Creator and the coming Judge of the world. If so, the means used for man's salvation is the costliest we can conceive, costly beyond man's furthest and profoundest thought. Before the cross of Christ we stand in silent adoration at the love which moved the Father to give His Son to die for man, and every head is bowed in shame at the guilt which made needful for man's salvation this infinite sacrifice. But our question returns. With awe we ask, Wherein lay the need for this costly means of salvation from the penalty of sin? Why could not the King by royal prerogative proclaim forgiveness, by His infinite power put down rebellion, and by the light which dwells in God reveal to the rebels the folly of their resistance and thus lead them back to obedience and to peace? That in Paul's view this was impossible, is proved by his plain and frequent teaching that man is saved by means of the death of Christ, and that for this end God gave His Son to die. For none can suppose that the love of God would prompt a needless sacrifice. Indeed, if the sacrifice were needless, its value as a manifestation of God's love would be diminished or destroyed. For no one desires a useless and costly gift. Our question therefore returns again, Wherein lay the need for so costly a means of salvation from the penalty of sin?

For an answer to this question we go back to the writings of the great Apostle. In Rom. iii. 25, 26, while expounding "the redemption which is in Christ

Jesus," Paul asserted that the aim of the propitiation in His blood was to give PROOF OF GOD'S RIGHTEOUSNESS, a proof rendered needful by His forbearing oversight of sins committed in days gone by, and that its ultimate aim was that God may be "HIMSELF RIGHTEOUS and a justifier of him who has faith in Jesus." This aim implies that apart from the propitiation in the blood of Christ and the proof thus afforded of the righteousness of God, God could not have been at the same time Himself righteous and also a justifier of those that believe. The phrase suggests that apart from the death of Christ God might conceivably have been *just*, but in this case not a *justifier* of guilty men; or on the other hand, conceivably though not possibly, a *justifier* of believers but not Himself *just*. Paul says that God gave Christ to die in order that while remaining Himself just He might be also a justifier of him who believes the words of Jesus. In other words, Paul teaches that the need for the death of Christ as the only possible means of man's salvation lay in the JUSTICE OF GOD.

This result cannot be modified by giving to the words "that He may be Himself righteous etc." a merely logical sense, viz. that God may be seen to be righteous etc. For, although the repeated words "for the proof of His righteousness" assert conspicuously that the manifestation of His righteousness even while pardoning the guilty was an aim of God in giving Christ to die, the whole sentence implies that this proof of divine justice was absolutely needful, and that

the very attribute of justice, which had been somewhat obscured by God's apparent oversight of sin in days gone by, demanded that in the days of full forgiveness the justice of God should be conspicuously vindicated before the eyes of men. And this necessity is illustrated by human governments, in which justice demands not only that right be done but that it be done manifestly and conspicuously. Take them as we will, Paul's words imply that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonise with His own justice the justification of believers.

The constant usage of the Greek language forbids us to take the words rendered "that He may be Himself just etc." as noting merely a result of the gift of Christ to die. For the phrase here used (*εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ.*) denotes always an intelligent purpose. For a mere result, *ὥστε* is used; as in Rom. vii. 6, Gal. ii. 13, Phil. i. 13, etc. In *v.* 25 *εἰς ἔνδειξιν* indisputably denotes a purpose; and it is difficult to give to the same preposition another sense in *v.* 26. Moreover, this exposition, even if grammatically admissible, would not greatly change the practical significance of the sentence. For if the death of Christ has, as a matter of result, harmonised the justification of believers with the justice of God, then, through His death, that which without it would have been unjust and therefore impossible has become just and actual. So remarkable a result could not have come without a deliberate design of God. In other words, the result reveals the design.

As just expounded, Rom. iii. 26*b* sheds wonderful light not only on *vv.* 24, 25 but upon the entire teaching of Paul and of the New Testament about the death of Christ. For we are everywhere taught that the death of Christ was absolutely needful for man's salvation. This need is now in a measure explained. For, as we have seen, Paul's teaching implies that, apart from the death of Christ, for God to pardon sin would be unjust. But God cannot possibly be unjust. Consequently, Paul's words imply that that which otherwise was impossible, God made actual by giving up Christ to die. If so, Christ was the *redemption* price of our salvation. For, every costly means needful to obtain some desired object, we speak of as a price paid for it. And this explanation of the term renders needless any question about the person to whom the price was paid. For the word is fully explained and justified by a common usage of human thought and life. The term *propitiation* is also explained. For, by Himself suffering death, the penalty of sin, Christ shelters the head of the sinner from the penalty due to his sins. Thus two foregoing verses are explained by the verse following.

The teaching in Rom. iii. 26*b* also implies that, in a correct sense, Christ died in our stead; as is suggested or asserted in 2 Cor. v. 21, Gal. iii. 13, 1 Tim. ii. 6, Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45. And we understand the conspicuous prominence given by Paul and throughout the New Testament to the death of Christ as the means of man's salvation. In short, Rom. iii. 26*b*

explains the teaching of the entire New Testament about the death of Christ; and of that teaching it is the only conceivable explanation.

Nowhere else in the New Testament is the death of Christ placed in express relation to the righteousness of God. But in several passages it is placed in conspicuous relation to the LAW: and in the Law the righteousness of God finds expression and literary embodiment. In Rom. vii. 4, sinners condemned by the righteous law of God to separation from Christ, who claims the race as His bride, are compared to a married woman forbidden by the law to be united to any one other than her still living husband: and the justified, who are set free by death, viz. by the death of Christ, are compared to a woman set free by death from the law which forbad her second marriage, viz. by the death of her first husband. This comparison, especially the words "dead to the law through the body of Christ," implies that through the death of Christ we have been placed beyond the domain of the law which condemned us in just punishment of our past sins to continued bondage under the present power of sin. In other words, it implies that through His death has been removed an obstacle to our saving union with Christ having its root in the Law of God. Now the Law is the authoritative utterance of the justice of God. Consequently, to say that through the death of Christ we have been placed beyond the domain of the Law, is to say that thereby the justification of believers has been harmonised with the righteousness of God. In

other words, Rom. vii. 4 is but a restatement, in view of the Law of God, which was ever present to Paul's thought, of the teaching of ch. iii. 26.

The same idea meets us again in Gal. ii. 19: "through law I died to law, that I may live for God: I am crucified with Christ." This can only mean that through a legal process they who believe in Christ have escaped from the condemnation of the Law and from the hindrance it presented to their salvation. The words "crucified with Christ" and "if through law comes righteousness, then has Christ died to no purpose" point clearly to the death of Christ as the mysterious means of this liberation from the claims of the Law.

Still more clear is Gal. iii. 13, 14 where we read that through His death upon the cross and the curse involved therein Christ bought us off from the curse pronounced by the Law upon all who fail to obey all its commands, in order that through faith we may obtain the blessings promised to Abraham. This implies that the Law presented a hindrance to the fulfilment of the promise, and that this hindrance was removed by the death of Christ.

Similar teaching is found in a later group of the Epistles of Paul. In Col. ii. 13 we read that God has made us "alive together with Christ, having forgiven us all trespasses." This forgiveness, involving spiritual resurrection, Paul further describes by saying in *v.* 14 that God blotted out the handwriting which with its decrees was against us; and adds that He nailed it to the cross and thus took it out of the way. He evidently means

that through the death of Christ upon the cross God has removed a barrier to our salvation which had its root in the written law. In Eph. ii. 14 we read of the middle wall of partition which Christ has broken down; and of the enmity which He has made inoperative by making inoperative the law of commandments in decrees. He adds that Christ's purpose was to reconcile to God both Jews and Gentiles, formerly at enmity with each other and with God, by means of the cross; and that by the cross Christ had slain this enmity. These somewhat difficult words imply that the enmity between man and God was removed by means of the death of Christ: and the context suggests that in so doing Christ made inoperative the condemnation of the written law.

These five very different passages reveal the firm hold on the thought of Paul of the idea that through the death of Christ was removed a hindrance to the salvation of men having its root in the Law of God. And, since the Law is the authoritative expression of the righteousness of God, this teaching is implied in, and implies, the teaching in Rom. iii. 26 that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonise the justification of believers with the justice of God. This important conception of the relation between the death of Christ on the cross and the salvation from the penalty of sin which He announced for all who believe His words, we are compelled by abundant and decisive documentary evidence to accept as firmly held and everywhere proclaimed by Paul.

LECTURE XIX.

RECONCILIATION TO GOD.

ANOTHER conspicuous element of Paul's teaching about the death of Christ, peculiar to him and a logical inference from the teaching expounded above, is found in the passages which speak of the death of Christ as a means of RECONCILIATION TO GOD.

In Rom. v. 1, the foregoing teaching, including specially ch. iii. 22-6, is summed up as "*peace with God* through Christ" resulting from "being justified by faith." In *v.* 10, which is a restatement of the argument in *v.* 9, the words "*reconciled to God* through the death of His Son" are given as an equivalent of "justified in His blood." And in *v.* 11 we read, "through whom we have now received the *reconciliation*." Similarly in 2 Cor. v. 18-20: "Who *reconciled* us to Himself through Christ . . . the ministry of the *reconciliation* . . . God was, in Christ, *reconciling* the world to Himself. . . . Be *reconciled* to God. In Eph. ii. 16, the assertion "He is our peace" is expounded to mean that Christ's purpose was "to *reconcile* both (*i.e.* Jews and Gentiles) to God through the cross, having slain the enmity by it." Paul thus teaches that there was

hostility between man and man and between man and God, and that in order to destroy it and to bring about peace Christ died on the cross. This thought he embodies in strong language by representing the cross as the instrument by which Christ destroyed the enmity and made peace. In Col. i. 20-22 the same purpose and the same instrument are ascribed to God: "He was pleased to *reconcile* all things to Himself, having made peace by the blood of His cross." The Christians at Colossæ were themselves once aliens and enemies; but "God has *reconciled* them in the body of Christ's flesh, through His death."

In the above passages we are again taught, in another form and in words which none can misunderstand, that God gave Christ to die in order to break down a barrier between Himself and man erected by man's sin, and that the means used for this end was the death of Christ.

The teaching just quoted deserves further attention. We notice that in Rom. v. 10 the words "reconciled to God through the death of His Son" are given as an equivalent to "justified in His blood" in *v.* 9. And we have seen that justification has with Paul no direct reference to any inward change in man's disposition towards God but only or at least chiefly to a changed relation of guilty man to the Righteous Judge. Moreover in Rom. i.—v. we read nothing about the effect of the death of Christ on the moral life of man. Similarly, in 2 Cor. v. 19 the assertion that "God was, in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself" is at once

followed and supported by the words "not reckoning to them their trespasses." And the exhortation "Be reconciled to God" in *v.* 20 is in *v.* 21 supported by the statement that "Him who knew no sin, on our behalf He made to be sin." In other words, Paul's teaching that believers are reconciled to God is an inference from his teaching that they are justified.

This inference is strictly correct. For every king is at war with all who break his laws. In this case, his royal power is put forth to arrest and punish his own subjects whose welfare he greatly desires. As long as they resist, they have to count upon their own king as their enemy. And, if transgression is war, forgiveness is peace. The pardoned criminal no longer has reason to fear the power of the king.

Once more. Paul teaches in Rom. iii. 26 that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonise with His own justice the justification of believers. If so, by the death of Christ is removed an obstacle to justification which has its root in the moral nature of God. This implies that God has something against the sinner which makes needful for his salvation this costly sacrifice. And in the light of this divine hostility to sin, and to the sinner so long as he persists in sin, must be interpreted the assertion, "we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son." In other words, by the death of Christ is removed not only the sinner's hostility to God but the sinner's exposure to God's hostility towards all sin.

To this hostility of God to sin, the words *reconciled*

to God in Rom. v. 10 seem chiefly to refer. For as yet Paul has said nothing about any inward moral change in the believer. But he has thrown into emphatic prominence the justice of God which made needful propitiation in the blood of Christ.

To this exposition it may be objected that God is never said to be reconciled to the sinner, always the SINNER RECONCILED to God. The constant phrase is "God reconciled us to Himself." God is the source, and the indirect object, man the immediate object, of reconciliation. From this, some have inferred that the only obstacle to peace is in man.

That this inference is incorrect, we learn from the use of the same phrase elsewhere. In Matt. v. 23, 24 we find a cognate and equivalent word. A man coming to sacrifice remembers that his brother "has something against" him. Here, manifestly, the obstacle to peace is not in the sacrificer but in the offended one. Else there would be no need to leave his gift and go away in order to be reconciled. For, any personal animosity against the other man, the offerer might himself at once lay aside. Our Lord evidently means that he must go and do his utmost to persuade the offended man to lay aside his feelings of hostility. Yet the offerer is bidden, "*be-reconciled* to thy brother." Similarly, in 1 Cor. vii. 11, a woman separated from her husband is bidden either to remain alone or to "*be-reconciled* to her husband." A Christian woman could have no option about laying aside any hostile feelings of her own. The only question is whether she can persuade her husband to

lay aside his hostility to her. Very instructive is 1 Sam. xxix. 4. Some Philistines objected to David going with them to war. They said that he was a servant of Saul; and asked, "wherewith will he *be-reconciled* to his master? will it not be with the heads of these men?" They feared that he would try to regain the favour of Saul by betraying and destroying the men with whom he had taken refuge. Yet this supposed removal of the anger of Saul is described as David being reconciled to his master. Of any enmity of David to Saul, there is no mention or thought. Similarly Josephus, in his *Antiq.* bk. v. 2. 8. This use of the word *reconciled* proves that Paul's language does not imply or suggest that the hindrance to peace removed by the death of Christ was wholly or chiefly in man.

On the other hand, in 2 Maccabees i. 5 we read, "may God hear your petitions and *be-reconciled* to you, and not forsake you in the evil time." So ch. vii. 33, "if the Lord be angry for a short time, He will again *be-reconciled* to His own servants": also ch. viii. 29. But Paul's phraseology is better. For it emphasizes the truth that reconciliation began with God and is His work; and that He is only the indirect object of it, whereas man is its direct object. The real hindrance is man's sin; and this hindrance God removes by the gift of His Son to die. But, as Paul has plainly taught, the reason why this hindrance can be removed only by the death of Christ is to be found in the justice of God.

Notice that the phraseology which refuses to make God the direct object of *reconciliation* is in complete

harmony with that which, as we saw in Lect. XVII., refuses to make Him the direct object of *propitiation*.

The double use, just noted, of the phrase before us warns us that this phrase does not, in itself, determine whether the hindrance to peace is in man or in God. That there is a hindrance in God, and in what sense, is determined by the teaching of Rom. iii. 26, of which ch. v. 1, 10, 11, are a compendious summing up.

Notice carefully that the propitiation and reconciliation and the harmonising of forgiveness with the justice of God are ever ATTRIBUTED by Paul TO THE FATHER'S LOVE. He provided, at infinite cost to Himself, the means which His own justice demanded as the only righteous condition of the justification of the ungodly. To represent the Father as implacable and as pacified only by the intercession and the death of Christ, is to contradict both the letter and the spirit of the teaching of Paul. Indeed, as we shall see in Part IV., the entire activity of Christ has its real origin in the Father. For, "the Son can do nothing except what He sees the Father doing."

The many passages quoted in Lectures XVI.—XIX. compel us to believe, as matter of historical fact, that Paul taught with complete confidence that the salvation announced by Christ for all who believe His words comes to them through His death upon the cross, that had He not died they could not have been saved from death, that in order to save them He deliberately laid down His life, and that the need for this costly means of salvation lay in man's sin, looked upon in the light

of the judicial righteousness of God; or, in other words, that Christ died in order to remove, and that by His death He actually removed, a hindrance to salvation having its firm root in the eternal justice of God. The various forms in which this conception of the death of Christ found expression, and their frequent recurrence in Paul's epistles, reveal its large place and controlling influence in his thought and life. Whatever be our estimate of this remarkable doctrine, abundant documentary evidence affords decisive proof that it was actually and confidently taught by the great Apostle who did most to found the Christianity of Europe.

It is worthy of note that, like the phrase "justified through faith," and the word "adoption," so the relation of the death of Christ to the justice and the law of God and the conception of the pardoned as reconciled to God through the death of His Son are in the New Testament, except in a metaphor in the Epistle to the Hebrews, peculiar to Paul. Doubtless we owe in part to the mental disposition of the great Apostle and in part to his training at the feet (Acts v. 34) of an "honoured teacher of the Law" this important legal aspect of the Gospel of Christ.

LECTURE XX.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

CLOSELY related to the Epistles of Paul but almost certainly by another hand is the Epistle to the Hebrews. In this interesting and most instructive document the death of Christ as the divinely-appointed means of man's salvation from sin is even more conspicuous than in the writings of Paul.

In Heb. ii. 9 we see Jesus "crowned with glory and honour, in order that by the grace of God on behalf of every one He might taste death;" in very close agreement with 2 Cor. v. 15, "on behalf of all He died, in order that, etc." So in *v.* 10, "it was fitting for Him . . . to make the Leader of their salvation perfect through sufferings." This I understand to mean that only through His suffering of death did Christ become a sufficient Saviour of men. In *v.* 14, the purpose for which the Son took part with men in blood and flesh is said to be "in order that through death He may bring to nought him that has the power of death and set free so many as by fear of death were held fast in bondage." These passages teach plainly that Christ's death was by deliberate design, in order to save men.

In *v.* 17 we read, in close agreement with Rom. iii. 25, that the Son became in all things like His brethren "in order to propitiate (*i.e.* to make propitiation for) the sins of the people." The foregoing references to the death of Christ leave no room for doubt that the writer means that, just as under the Old Covenant propitiation was almost always made by the blood of an innocent victim, so Christ by His own death saves His people from the penalty due to their sins.

In Heb. ix. 12 we read that Christ "by means of His own blood entered the Holy places, having found an eternal redemption." These words assert plainly that our deliverance is brought about by the death of Christ. In contrast (*v.* 13) to the blood shed in the ancient sacrifices, we read in *v.* 14 that "the blood of Christ . . . will cleanse the conscience from dead works, to serve the living God." And in *v.* 15 we have, as in *v.* 12, the death of Christ as a means of "redemption;" in close agreement with Rom. iii. 24, Eph. i. 7, Titus ii. 14, 1 Tim. ii. 6.

That Christ's death is a means or condition of our salvation, dominates the remainder of Heb. ix. In *v.* 16, this idea finds a new and remarkable expression. The Greek word *διαθήκη*, the constant equivalent in the LXX. for a Hebrew word denoting a covenant or compact between man and man and the Old Covenant between God and Israel, denotes almost always in classical Greek a testamentary deed by which a man disposes of his property after his death, and which becomes a valid legal document only by the testator's

death. This specific use of the word selected by Christ, as recorded in 1 Cor. xi. 25 etc., to describe the new compact of God with man involved in the Gospel proclaimed by Christ, the writer to the Hebrews accepts as setting forth the relation between the death of Christ and the salvation announced by Him. By so doing, he asserts that the Gospel is both a covenant in which one person binds himself to another to bestow certain benefits on certain conditions, and also a testament which becomes legally valid only by the testator's death. In other words, the metaphor before us implies that Christ's death was needful for the legal validity of the New Covenant. In other words, the Covenant which announces forgiveness of sins for all who believe the Gospel would have been invalid apart from the death of Christ. This play upon the word *covenant* is in close agreement with Paul's teaching in Rom. vii. 4 and Col. ii. 14 that through the death of Christ has been removed a legal obstacle to the justification of believers. The coincidence is the more remarkable because the phraseology and the modes of thought in which this conception of the death of Christ finds expression are altogether different from those of Paul.

That Christ died in order to save men from their sins, is very prominent in Heb. ix. 26, "for the putting away of sin by the sacrifice of Himself;" and in *v.* 28, "once offered in order to bear the sins of many." Similarly ch. x. 12, "having offered one sacrifice on behalf of sins," and *v.* 29, "having counted as a common thing the blood of the Covenant in which

he was sanctified." So ch. xiii. 12, "Jesus, in order that He might sanctify the people through His own blood, suffered outside the camp."

It is now evident that Paul's important and very definite conception of the death of Christ in its relation to our salvation is reproduced to the full in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Its writer held that Christ's violent death upon the cross was the means of man's salvation, and that for this end He died. He speaks of it twice as a means of "redemption;" and of Christ as making "propitiation for the sins of the people." And, still more remarkably, he uses a comparison which implies that the death of Christ was needful for the legal validity of the Covenant which in God's name He made with men. He thus implies that the need for the death of Christ as a means of salvation lay in the justice of God.

LECTURE XXI.

OTHER NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING.

WITH the teaching of Paul and of the Epistle to the Hebrews about the death of Christ, we will now compare that of Christ Himself as recorded in the four Gospels.

Very conspicuous in each of the Synoptist Gospels is the incident narrated in Matt. xvi. 13-28, Mark viii. 27—ix. 1, Luke ix. 18-27. Christ has drawn His disciples far away from the temple courts at Jerusalem and from the crowded shores of the Lake of Gennesaret in order, amid the solitudes overshadowed by the snows of Hermon, to reveal to them truths not yet made known. But before doing this He inquires whether the truths already taught have been learnt. The Master asks, "Whom do men say that I am?" Peter's answer is ready: and he does but express the thought of all. "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." This satisfactory answer is at once followed by a new revelation. "From that time began Jesus to show to His disciples that He MUST NEEDS go away to Jerusalem, and suffer many things from the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be put to death, and the third day be

raised." Our Lord goes on to say that, not only must He be crucified, but "if any one wishes to come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me."

Here is a Man who has not yet reached His prime, and is apparently in health and strength, saying that necessity compels Him to go away from Galilee, where He has many friends, to Jerusalem, and there be put to death by the leaders of His nation. In other words, Christ not only foresees His own violent death but is resolved to make a long journey and to put Himself in the hands of those who, as He knows, will kill Him. He thus sets aside as inapplicable to Himself a command given (Matt. x. 23) to His disciples, "When they persecute you in one city, flee to another." He did so under a special necessity, conspicuously asserted in each of the Synoptist Gospels: "He *must needs* go away to Jerusalem . . . and be killed." This necessity cannot be explained by the young Teacher's foresight of the deadly hostility which He knew that His teaching would arouse. For this would not account for His going to Jerusalem, the city of His foes. By going where He knows that men will kill Him, He deliberately laid down His life. And He tells us that all this was needful. We notice also that in each of the Synoptist Gospels Christ's death is, in His own thought, to be followed by resurrection. This suggests irresistibly that to Him death and resurrection were means needful to attain some further end.

In Matt. xvii. 12, Mark ix. 12, Christ again announces

that suffering awaits Him. Similarly, in Matt. xvii. 22, 23, Mark ix. 31, and less fully in Luke ix. 44, He foretells that He will be surrendered into the hands of men, and that they will kill Him, and that He will rise from the dead. In Matt. xx. 18, 19, Mark x. 33, 34, Luke xviii. 31, 32, He repeats the announcement. This repetition throws into conspicuous prominence His approaching death. It is the more remarkable, because up to this point we have no indication of hostility so deadly and so powerful as to close up, even to a young and popular teacher, all hope of escape.

A DELIBERATE PURPOSE to die is implied also in Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45 : "the Son of Man came . . . to give His life a ransom for many." In these words we trace to the lips of Christ Paul's teaching that the death of Christ was a redemption-price for man. His words may be accurately rendered, "a ransom instead of many." The preposition used, *ἀντί*, is the strongest word in the Greek language to denote the substitution of one in place of another. Christ here asserts most plainly that He is about to die instead of men. That this is implied in the teaching of Paul, and in what sense, we have already seen.

Very conspicuous in each of the Synoptist Gospels is the institution of the Lord's Supper on the night of His betrayal. In Matt. xxvi. 28, Christ is recorded to say "This is My blood which is being shed on behalf of many, for forgiveness of sins": so Mark xiv. 24, omitting the last words. In Luke xxii. 20, as in 1 Cor. xi. 25, our Lord is represented as saying, "This cup

is the New Covenant in My blood." All these four accounts agree to assert or imply that Christ was about to die a violent death in order to gain for men forgiveness of sins and to set up a New Covenant between God and man. That with this knowledge of what was awaiting Him in the garden Christ deliberately went there instead of hiding Himself as He had instructed His disciples to do in similar circumstances, thus sacrificing a life infinitely the most valuable on earth, implies a purpose which could be attained only by His death, a purpose worthy of this great sacrifice. Moreover, that a young Teacher, while in freedom and in health, ordained a rite to commemorate His own approaching death, reveals both His purpose to die and the immense importance of His death. Such a rite, ordained under such circumstances, is unique in the history of the world.

In Matt. xxvii. 46, Mark xv. 34, Christ is recorded to have cried in agony upon the cross, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" In order to explain a misunderstanding of these words by some who stood by, they are given in their original Aramaic form. It is unsafe to build theological argument on words wrung from the suffering of a dying man. But I cannot forbear to point out that these words of mental anguish confirm the teaching of Paul and the New Testament about the death of Christ. For the Saviour's cry reveals, or at least suggests, a shadow fallen between His human spirit and God. Yet, if there is any moment in which God does not abandon His servants but rather

enters into closest fellowship with them, it is when for His sake they lay down their lives. At this supreme moment Christ speaks of Himself as abandoned by God to whom He was obedient even to death. The abandonment demands explanation. The explanation is found in the teaching expounded above. I venture to suggest that the shadow was no other than that cast by the guilt of man's sin over the spirit of Him who was "made sin that we may become a righteousness of God in Him."

In John i. 29 the Baptist points to Christ, shortly before (ch. ii. 13) the Passover, as "the Lamb of God which takes away the sin of the world." Such words at such a time recall irresistibly the Paschal lamb which saved the firstborn from death by itself dying. In ch. vi. 51, after speaking of Himself as "the bread of life," Christ says, "the bread which I will give is My flesh on behalf of the life of the world." With conspicuous repetition, the same teaching is enforced in *vv.* 53, 54, 55, and 56. Whatever else these remarkable words mean, they assert plainly and with marked emphasis that the approaching violent death of Christ was a necessary condition, and in this sense a means, of the salvation of men. For flesh given to eat involves death, and even the eating of bread involves the destruction of vegetable life.

Similarly, in John x. 15, 17 Christ says, "I lay down My life on behalf of the sheep. . . . I lay down My life that I may take it again." In ch. xi. 51, the Evangelist expounds certain words of Caiaphas to be a

prophecy that "Jesus was about to die on behalf of the nation. . . . and in order that also the scattered children of God may be gathered into one." In ch. xii. 24, after saying that the hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified, Christ adds the remarkable words, "Verily, verily I say to you, except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abides alone: but if it die it bears much fruit." Now a grain of wheat does not multiply into many grains unless it be buried in the ground out of sight and thus in some sense die. The use of this comparison implies that Christ's approaching death and burial were a necessary condition of the harvest of souls He will some day reap. Similarly in *v.* 32 Christ is reported to say, "and I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to Myself." The writer adds, "this said He signifying by what sort of death He was about to die." As thus expounded, the words of Christ assert that His approaching death will be a means of the salvation of men. In ch. xv. 13, Christ says to His disciples, in close agreement with ch. x. 15, 17, "greater love than this no one has, that one lay down his life on behalf of his friends."

Thus, in each of the four Gospels, teaching is attributed to Christ at important crises of His life which, though less full than that of Paul, is not only in complete harmony with it but is incapable of explanation except on the principles asserted by Paul. In other words, the entire teaching of Paul about the death of Christ is a legitimate inference

from that attributed to Christ in the earliest records of His teaching, records altogether independent of the Epistles of Paul.

Very closely related to the Fourth Gospel, and containing important teaching about the death of Christ, is the First Epistle of John. In ch. i. 7 we read, "the blood of Jesus, His Son, cleanses us from all sin." This implies clearly and conspicuously that Christian purity is a result of the death of Christ. That in *v.* 9 God is said to be "faithful and *righteous* to forgive us our sins," links together the righteousness of God and the mercy which forgives sins; an approach to Paul's teaching that God gave Christ to die in order to be Himself righteous and a justifier of him that believes in Jesus. In ch. ii. 2 Christ is said to be "a propitiation for our sins . . . and for all the world." Similarly ch. iv. 10: "God . . . loved us and sent His Son to be a propitiation for our sins." The last two passages are in close agreement with the important teaching in Rom. iii. 25, "whom God set forth to be a propitiation . . . in His blood;" and prove that this mode of presenting the relation of the death of Christ to man's salvation is an element common to these two very different types of New Testament thought. In close agreement with John xv. 13, we read in 1 John iii. 16, "in this we know love, that He on our behalf laid down His life."

The Book of Acts does not say much about the spiritual significance of the death of Christ. His disciples were more eager to proclaim His resurrection

as the firm ground of faith in Him than to expound a recondite doctrine which can be appreciated only by those who have already put faith in Christ. But in Acts ii. 23 Peter on the day of Pentecost declares, "Him being delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay." He thus asserts that the death of Christ was no mere calamity, but was an accomplishment of a divine purpose. And this involves very much of the teaching of Paul. A most important coincidence is found in Acts xx. 28, where to the elders from Ephesus Paul speaks of "the Church of God (or, of the Lord) which He purchased with His own blood." We have here a line of thought familiar in the writings of Paul.

It is worthy of note that the Epistle of James, which does not clearly announce salvation through faith, does not mention the death of Christ. This silence suggests the relation between the two doctrines.

In 1 Peter i. 18 the death of Christ is represented as the redemption-price of deliverance from a useless manner of life inherited from human ancestors: "not with perishable things, silver or gold, were ye redeemed from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers, but with precious blood, as of a lamb blameless and spotless, even of Christ." And, that the death of Christ stood in relation to our sins, is stated in ch. ii. 24, "who Himself bore our sins in His body on the tree;" and in ch. iii. 18, "Christ once died for sins, a just one for unjust ones, in order that He might bring us to

God." This last passage also asserts that Christ died with a deliberate purpose.

The evidence for the genuineness of the Second Epistle which claims to be from the Apostle Peter is far less satisfactory than that for the First Epistle. But, whatever be its authorship, it is an embodiment of early Christian thought. And I notice in passing that in 2 Peter ii. 1 we read of some who "deny the Master who bought them." We have here again the idea of purchase already found in the first two Gospels and in 1 Peter. And we are told that Christ died even for some who will ultimately perish, for the persons referred to are "bringing upon themselves quick destruction."

That Christ's death was a means of our salvation, a means rendered needful by man's sin, is stated clearly in Rev. i. 5: "to Him that loves us, and loosed us from our sins in His own blood." That Christian purity and eternal life are results of the death of Christ, is again conspicuously asserted in ch. vii. 15: "they washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne." In ch. v. 6 we see "a Lamb standing as slain." And in *v.* 9 we have again the death of Christ as the purchase-price of our new relation to God: "Thou wast slain and didst purchase them for God, in Thy blood, out of every tribe etc." No words could state more plainly than do those just quoted that the death of Christ upon the cross is the means by which He saves men from the penalty and bondage of sin.

To sum up. The Epistles of Paul and of Peter,

and that to the Hebrews, agree with each of the four Gospels, 1 John, and the Book of Revelation to teach conspicuously and frequently that the death of Christ is, even as compared with His spotless life and His matchless teaching, the means of our salvation; that for this end He deliberately laid down His life; that this costly means of salvation was absolutely needful; and that the need for it lay in man's sin. Paul goes beyond the other writers of the New Testament in teaching that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonise with His own justice the justification of believers. This teaching he confirms by asserting in various ways that through the death of Christ we are liberated from the claims and the curse of the Law. A similar confirmation is found in a legal metaphor in the Epistle to the Hebrews. All this implies that the righteousness of God was a hindrance to the forgiveness of sin, and that this hindrance was removed by God through the death of Christ.

From the above it appears that the various and very different writers of the New Testament are in COMPLETE AGREEMENT touching the relation of the death of Christ to our salvation. They differ only in that Paul traces the need for this costly means of salvation not merely to man's sin but to the justice of God. But this further development is in close accord with the thought of Paul in which, as we have seen in expounding his doctrine of Justification through Faith, the righteousness and law of God occupied a large place. Moreover this further development is a legitimate inference from

teaching common to nearly all the writers of the New Testament. For righteousness is that attribute of God which takes special cognisance of sin. Consequently, a need created by sin must have its root in the justice of God.

The remarkable agreement just noted reveals the common source of the various types of teaching embodied in the New Testament. It proves indisputably that the elements common to its various writers are due to the Great Teacher at whose feet they all sat. In other words, the documentary evidence we have examined compels us to believe that as matter of historical fact the Author of the great religious impulse which has saved the world taught that the forgiveness of sins which He indisputably announced for all who should believe His words was to come through His own approaching death, and that for this end He was about voluntarily to die. This we must now accept as well-proved historical fact.

How this fact stands related to whatever else we know about the nature of God and the method of His government, we shall next consider.

LECTURE XXII.

THE RATIONALE OF THE ATONEMENT.

WE have now proved by strictly historical and by decisive evidence that Jesus of Nazareth taught that His own death on the cross stands in unique relation to man's salvation, as the means by which God receives into His favour, in spite of their past sins, all who believe the good news announced by Christ; that for this end Christ deliberately died; and that the need for this costly means of salvation lay in man's sin. From this teaching of Christ Paul inferred that the need for the death of Christ as a means of salvation from sin lay in the justice of God. And this inference we found to be the only satisfactory explanation of the teaching of Christ as recorded and re-echoed in the New Testament. In PART IV. we shall find complete historical proof that the Crucified claimed to be in a sense shared by no other the Son of God, the eternal companion of His glory and the partner of His infinite attributes, the Creator and the Judge of the world. This teaching and these claims we have traced or shall trace to the Author of the great religious impulse which has turned back the

whole current of human life and history from the ruin to which it was hastening in His day into a path of sustained progress. In PART V. we shall find historical evidence which will compel us to believe that this Saviour of the world rose from the dead. From such a Teacher, supported by such credentials, this teaching about His own death speaks with an authority we cannot contradict. The facts of the case will compel us to believe not only that the disciples of Christ correctly understood their Master, but that the doctrine they learnt from Him is true. This will be, when the argument of this volume is complete, an assured result of our theological research.

This result evokes at once earnest questions, and thus becomes a starting point for further research. What we have learnt from the pen of Paul and traced to the lips of Christ, demands explanation. Especially the frequently asserted or implied necessity for His death suggests inquiry touching the ground of this necessity. We ask two pressing questions: (1) Why could not God magnanimously pardon sin, apart from the death of Christ, by royal prerogative? (2) And, if such pardon by prerogative be forbidden by the justice of God, as Paul's teaching implies, how is the pardon of the guilty reconciled with justice by the death of an innocent victim?

To these questions the New Testament gives NO DIRECT AND COMPLETE ANSWER. Possibly, at least to the second question, no answer in all points satisfactory can at present be given. But they cannot be

set aside as unreasonable. Nor, if asked reverently, can they be condemned as intruding into that which God has not revealed. For many truths are hidden beneath the surface of Holy Scripture and beneath the phenomena around us in order that they may be rewards of patient search. These questions are only an attempt to trace, along lines laid down in the New Testament, the connection between the teaching of Christ and His Apostles about His own death and whatever else we know about God's moral government of the world, in order thus to understand this one doctrine as a part of a larger whole. They are prompted by a conviction that, just as the universe is one, consisting of many parts, all related, so every matter of human knowledge stands related to whatever else is known. This deep conviction of the unity of whatever is known and of whatever exists has grown with the growth of human knowledge; and in all ages it has been a fruitful source of intellectual progress. We may therefore hope to gain, by comparing the teaching of Christ and His Apostles about His death with whatever we know about God's government of men, a fuller knowledge of the relation between the death of Christ and the salvation announced by Him. For all knowledge of broad principles sheds light upon specific cases within their domain.

Notice carefully that the incompleteness of the best answers to these questions does NOTHING TO WEAKEN the foundation of the results already attained. For these results rest on abundant and decisive documentary

evidence. Similarly, we frequently have evidence which compels us to believe that an event has taken place although we are utterly at a loss to know by what means it has been brought about. In such cases, the abundant evidence for the main fact prompts inquiry about details. So now our loyal acceptance of the teaching of Christ and His Apostles prompts further and reverent research.

We must seek answers in harmony with all the FACTS OF THE CASE; or, in other words, we must seek an hypothesis which, if true, will account for and explain all that the writers of the New Testament say about the death of Christ. If we can find an hypothesis which does this, and which is also the only conceivable explanation of all the facts of the case, we may accept it, so far as it goes, as probably true. To this method of hypotheses tested and verified by facts is due almost all progress of human knowledge. We thus advance from matters of direct observation to broad and deep principles.

We ask then, Why could not God pardon sin, apart from the death of Christ, BY MERE PREROGATIVE, as a father forgives a penitent child? A reply is suggested by the analogy of civil government. Practically, a king cannot pardon the guilty. What men call pardon is merely a disguise veiling the perplexing incompleteness of the evidence, insufficient either for condemnation or for acquittal, or a recognition of extenuating circumstances which the sentence could not take into account, or occasionally a bribe to induce accessories to betray

the principal offender. This last is never given except with extreme reluctance, and is always felt to be a partial failure of justice. When guilt is certain and when there are no palliations, even the most merciful government is deaf to appeals for mercy, and the sentence is invariably carried out. In such cases, to pardon the guilty would evoke a cry of indignation which would shake the firmest throne.

We notice also that impartial administration of punitive justice is expressly commanded in the Bible. So Prov. xvii. 15: "he that justifies the wicked and he that condemns the righteous, both of them alike are an abomination to Jehovah."

The reason of all this is not far to seek. "When the guilty goes free, the innocent is injured." The security of the state demands the certain and speedy punishment of all who break its laws. For certainty of punishment is a strong deterrent from crime. To remove or weaken this deterrent, is to disorganise and break up society. National welfare demands the maintenance to the highest degree in national life, and as far as possible in the thought of each citizen, of the inevitable sequence of crime and punishment.

It is now evident that, in human government, to pardon the guilty is not only unjust, as running counter to a principle underlying all law, but unkind. Mercy to an individual is cruelty to the nation. The greatest kindness is a strict administration of justice. For this will deter from crime many who are morally weak and thus save them from infinite moral injury; and it

will save from their violence those who would be its victims.

This impartial administration of justice always secures respect for the governor. And respect for the governor always strengthens a government. On the other hand, the governor who fails to carry out the punitive regulations of the law is looked down upon with contempt even by those whom he pardons. And this contempt weakens both his government and the state. Even in parental rule it is frequently, perhaps always, expedient that a disobedient child, even though penitent, experience the ill result of disobedience. In such cases, parental love prompts and demands punishment. The father who cannot punish is an enemy to his son. Everywhere in human life it is of the utmost importance to maintain the invariable sequence of sin and sorrow, of right-doing and happiness.

All this sheds light upon God's government of the world. For, just as the principles of right and wrong which underlie all government, so deeply interwoven into human consciousness, are manifestly of superhuman origin and authority, so the absolute necessity of government for human welfare proves it to be an ordinance of God. We cannot think of God except as acting upon, and by His action maintaining, those principles of justice which are universal among men. That which in man would be unjust and contemptible, we cannot conceive to be consistent with the character of God. We therefore cannot doubt that the principles

which underlie good human government underlie also God's government of men.

If the above inference be correct, the justice of God would forbid pardon by mere prerogative; and the justice which forbad it is but one aspect of that love which is the essence of God and which seeks ever the highest welfare of His creatures. All human analogy assures us that the love of God demands maintenance of the invariable sequence of sin and sorrow by an impartial administration of the prescriptions of the Law, and therefore forbids the pardon of sin by mere prerogative.

This result is in close harmony with the frequent teaching of the Bible that all sin will and must receive due retribution.

Looking at the matter from another point of view, we may say that the creation of free and intelligent agents made needful for their highest good, as a deterrent from sin, the threat of punishment of sin, and that the truth of God made needful due infliction of the threatened punishment. Thus both the justice and the truth of God, these being an outflow of His love, forbad the pardon of sin by mere prerogative.

These considerations answer fairly our first question.

A much more difficult question remains. If it be inconsistent with the justice of God to pardon sin by mere prerogative, how is this inconsistency removed or lessened by the DEATH OF THE INNOCENT in order TO SAVE THE GUILTY from the due punishment of their sins? It must be admitted that such transfer of

punishment would not be allowed in human government; nor would it ordinarily serve the purposes of justice. But that which would not be permitted in the human administration of justice was, as I have proved, according to the express teaching of Paul and the implied teaching of the rest of the New Testament writers, actually ordained by God as the means of saving the world. This difference between human and divine administration of justice demands now our best attention.

Our question is not answered by the conspicuous teaching of Paul and John that the death of Christ reveals the wonderful LOVE OF GOD to man, and that the love thus revealed changes into love towards God the hard heart of man. So Rom. v. 8: "a proof of His own love towards us God gives, that while we were yet sinners Christ died on our behalf." Similarly 2 Cor. v. 15: "the love of Christ constrains us, having judged this, that One died for all, therefore all died." Also 1 John iv. 10, 19: "herein is love . . . that He loved us and sent His Son to be a propitiation for our sins . . . we love because He first loved us." For this important truth does not explain Paul's teaching in Rom. iii. 26, vii. 4, Col. ii. 14 about the relation between Christ's death and the justice of God. Nor does it explain the necessity which moved Christ, as recorded in Matt. xvi. 21, etc., to go up to Jerusalem and put Himself in the hands of those who, as He foresaw, would kill Him. Moreover, love never prompts a needless sacrifice, or a sacrifice needful only to reveal its own intensity or to obtain for its object something

which might be had at less cost. Indeed we sometimes resent, and always regret, useless expenditure on our behalf. On the other hand, when a great benefit, which could not otherwise be ours, or deliverance from great and eminent peril or loss, is obtained for us at great cost, this sacrifice on our behalf combined with a benefit worthy of the sacrifice fills us with gratitude. The costliness of the means used by God to harmonise with His own justice the justification of sinners and thus make it possible proves clearly that no less costly means would attain the same result. Our question therefore comes back to us unanswered, Why was SO COSTLY a revelation of God's love NEEDFUL for man's salvation?

For an answer we will turn again to the great passage, Rom. iii. 25, 26. Paul here asserts that God gave Christ to be a propitiation through faith, in His own blood, in order to afford proof of the righteousness of God; that He was moved to give this proof by His own apparent tolerance of sin in days gone by; and that the ultimate aim of this proof was to harmonise with His own justice the justification of believers. In other words, the immediate purpose of the death of Christ was to manifest the justice of God in view of past forbearance which seemed to obscure it and in view of the Gospel which announces God's reception into His favour of all those who believe the words of Jesus. The concluding words of *v.* 26 imply that the justice of God itself demanded this manifestation, that it would have been unjust of God to allow His justice to remain obscured and to pardon sin without giving,

through the death of Christ, this public proof of His justice.

It is worthy of note that in human government justice demands not only impartial administration but administration manifestly and conspicuously impartial. Whatever obscures or reveals the justice of the ruler hinders or helps the ends of justice.

The question before us now is, Does the death of Christ as a means of man's salvation give proof of the justice of God? If so, justice demanded it as a condition of man's salvation. For justice ever claims, even for the good of the governed, to be openly manifested.

Now justice is the divine attribute which underlies the sequence of sin and sorrow and death. Whatever reveals the inevitability of this sequence reveals God's impartial administration of His own laws. I shall endeavour to show that the death of Christ, following His union with a race smitten with the deadly curse of sin, does reveal this inevitable sequence and thus reveals God's impartial administration in a way which elicits our profound reverence for the character of God and serves a definite moral purpose.

Let us look again at the sequence of sin and sorrow. So deeply rooted in our moral nature is our conviction of this sequence that we cannot doubt that the sequence itself is ordained by the Author of our being. Nor can we doubt that the sequence is universal and inevitable. We notice also that frequently, indeed usually, sin brings sorrow not only to the sinner but to others, often to innocent persons, especially to those closely related

to the guilty one. So frequent is this result of sin that it must be by the ordinance of God. And this far-reaching effect of sin reveals, even more than does the suffering of the guilty, the tremendous and deadly power of sin. The pain thus inflicted on the innocent, by a widespread and divinely-ordained moral sequence, is in some sense a vicarious punishment of sin.

The injury wrought by sin upon those associated with the sinner is, in spite of its manifest hardship, a real gain to the race. For, a world in which none suffered except by their own fault would be a far less effective school of moral discipline. In view of this gain, we cannot doubt that even this strange connection of sin and innocent suffering was ordained by the wisdom and love of God for the good of mankind.

To the human race thus constituted, the Son of God occupies, as we shall see, a unique and very close relation as its Creator and Lawgiver and Judge. It was He who called man into existence, wrote upon the hearts of all men the great principles of morality, linked together moral sequences, and will pronounce and inflict the punishment of sin.

At His incarnation the Son of God entered into a still closer relation to our race. He took upon Him flesh and blood and all the conditions of human bodily life. He shared with man that flesh and blood on which rests, as we shall see in another volume, in consequence of man's sin, the doom of death. This partnership involved, unless the incarnate Son was to be sheltered by special divine intervention from the

consequence of His own act, suffering and death. It involved also close contact with man's sin, a contact which could not but be infinitely painful to the pure human spirit of Jesus. In Him, pure human nature experienced to the full, while still unstained by its pollution, the painful and shameful consequences of sin. The inevitable result of this close nearness to man was mental and bodily agony, followed by death. And these inevitable results of the incarnation were foreseen and willingly endured by the Son of God.

This intimate union of the Creator Son with His creature man was probably part of the original purpose of creation, and was probably needful for the accomplishment of that purpose and for the highest interest of men. For we may well believe that an intelligent creature can attain his full development and happiness only by closest possible union with His Creator. Had man not sinned, this union would have involved neither death nor suffering. Through man's sin, this union of the Son of God with man, needful for man's highest development, involved all that Christ actually suffered.

The Son of God became Man. He thus became conscious, by actual experience, of bodily pain. His pure human spirit felt, as none but the pure can feel, the shame and degradation of sin. And the testimony He bore to God's claims upon man exposed Him to the fury of bad men. No hand from heaven was reached out to save Him from these various consequences of His entrance into a body doomed to die and into a race dominated by sin. On Him sin worked out its full

consequences until the human body of the Sinless One hung dead upon the cross. In other words, in the incarnate Son, the sequence of sin and suffering, ordained by Himself as Creator, was maintained inviolate and ran its full course although in doing so it struck with infinite agony the Son Himself.

If, as suggested above, the close union of the Creator Son with His creature man was needful for man's highest good, the sufferings of Christ just described were, on account of man's sin, needful for the same. In full view of the inevitable consequences of so doing, the Son willingly entered into human flesh. And, that God permitted the full consequences of sin to run their course, even though they struck down His only begotten and beloved Son, reveals in the strongest manner we can conceive the inevitability of this sequence. In Christ's death we see the essential deadliness of sin and its inevitable result as we could not otherwise have done.

This manifestation of the inevitable sequence of sin and sorrow serves a great moral purpose. God's forbearance in not inflicting speedily the full punishment of sin in former days, and His proclamation of pardon for all who believe the good news announced by Christ, might seem to indicate a tolerance of sin itself by God, as though it were not essentially evil and deadly. The cross of Christ forbids the suggestion. That sin slew the Author of life when He came, for our salvation, in some sense under its domain, is the strongest motive possible for avoiding all contact with sin.

Thus the death of Christ reveals the justice of God.

By revealing the inevitable sequence of sin and death, a sequence which could not be broken even by the incarnation of the Eternal Son, it reveals the divine attribute underlying that sequence. In the death of Christ we see the Father not overriding, but submitting to, His own law. We see the strong One submitting to the restraints which for their good He imposed on those under His control. Such submission and self-restraint always secure for a ruler our profound respect. Pardon of sin under such circumstances cannot loosen any moral obligation. For He who proclaims pardon maintains at infinite cost to Himself the moral sequences on which rests the highest well-being of men.

As an illustration of the subject before us, appeal has often been made to a famous story about Zaleucus recorded by Valerius Maximus (bk. vi. 5, ext. 3) which tells that, when the lawgiver's own son had been found guilty of adultery, a crime for which the punishment prescribed was loss of both eyes, Zaleucus, in order to save his son's sight and yet adhere to the letter of the law, ordered one of his son's eyes to be put out and one of his own. It is true that, by so doing, he evaded inflicting the full intention of the law, which was total blindness. But, whatever this story be worth, whether true or false, it proves conclusively that voluntary endurance of suffering by the innocent may serve the interests of justice as effectively as full punishment inflicted on the guilty. For the mutilated face of Zaleucus would proclaim, if the story be true, his inflexible determination to administer impartially his own

laws. In view of such self-sacrifice, none would dare to break the law in hope of escape from punishment. In other words, the self-inflicted punishment rendered morally harmless the partial forgiveness of the crime. Similarly, the death of the Son of God reveals, even more clearly than would the death of all the guilty ones, God's purpose to maintain the sequence of sin and suffering. Moreover, just as this story is a tribute of honour to Zaleucus, so in all ages the servants of Christ have seen in His death a manifestation of the justice of God which has secured their profound homage. And this vindication of divine justice has, in their minds, rendered morally harmless the forgiveness of sins announced in the Gospel.

Sometimes in actual life the suffering of the innocent caused by the sin of others serves a moral purpose. Occasionally dissolute parents have been aroused to a consciousness of their vileness by the suffering they have inflicted upon their children. Thus innocent suffering has fulfilled a moral purpose.

An illustration of the good moral effect of refusing to pardon the guilty when that refusal eventually cost the lives of innocent victims occurred some years ago in Greece. A party of Englishmen were captured by brigands at Marathon. The captors offered to release them on condition of a large ransom and a full pardon. The king was most anxious to save the captives; and was willing, for this end, to pay a large price. But he could not pardon the guilty. For, to permit the robbers to enjoy in peace their ill-gotten gains, would have been

an inducement to similar acts of violence by others, and would thus render all life in Greece insecure. Indeed, the discontent which had culminated in the dethronement of the king's predecessor, Otho, had been greatly aggravated by his misplaced mercy in the frequent pardon of criminals and by the insecurity resulting therefrom. The Englishmen were murdered. But the king's refusal to pardon the robbers struck a blow at brigandage in Greece from which it never recovered. It became at once manifest that the guilty could no longer count on mercy. And travelling in Greece is now said to be almost as safe as in England. In this case, the capture was not foreseen, nor was the death of the innocent voluntary. But the interests of justice and of the nation were helped by the death of innocent men caused by the sin of others. And in these points it affords a parallel to the teaching of the New Testament about the death of Christ.

So far we have spoken of Christ's death only as resulting from His entrance into mortal human life. But, for the ends of justice, it was needful that His death should be placed in conspicuous connection with man's sin. This end was attained by His violent death on the cross. For, indisputably, He died because He was good and had preached righteousness among men who were bad. This all-important connection between His death and our sin would not have been manifested had Christ fled from His enemies and afterwards died a natural death. It was therefore needful for the manifestation of divine justice and for our salvation that He should put

Himself in the hands of His enemies. And in this sense we may interpret His own words recorded in Matt. xvi. 21, Luke xxiv. 46, "He must needs go away to Jerusalem . . . and be put to death," etc.

Whatever estimate may be formed of the above attempt to explain that which the writers of the New Testament have left unexplained, abundant documentary evidence compels us to believe that Christ taught that He was Himself about willingly to die in order to save men from the due punishment of their sins; and that Paul taught that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonise with His own justice the justification of sinners and to give proof of this harmony. We have also observed that the teaching of Paul explains fully, and is the only explanation of, the teaching of the rest of the New Testament about the death of Christ. And we have now seen that the analogy of human governments affords a strong presumption that God could not pardon sin by mere prerogative; and that the death upon the cross of Him who, in order to fulfil man's original and glorious destiny, Himself became Man reveals the inevitable moral sequence imposed upon man by God for man's good. In this real sense the death of Christ, as a means of saving man, reveals the justice of God, a revelation needful in order to vindicate His justice.

This explanation, imperfect as it is, does something to harmonise the teaching of the New Testament about the death of Christ with other teaching contained therein, with the intuitions of man's moral sense, and with the principles of human government.

LECTURE XXIII.

FOR WHOM DID CHRIST DIE?

IN Lect. XIV. we found a casual statement of Paul in Rom. ii. 4 implying that upon all men God is bringing to bear influences leading to salvation, influences which will actually save all who yield to them; and we found important confirmation of this teaching in words of Jesus recorded in John vi. 44, 65. We have now heard from Paul that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonise with His own justice the justification of believers. This implies that apart from the death of Christ salvation, and therefore these divine influences leading towards salvation, would have been impossible. If so, these influences and the salvation resulting from them in all who believe the Gospel were a part of the purpose for which God gave His Son to die. In other words, the purpose of the death of Christ embraced the ENTIRE HUMAN RACE.

This universal purpose of the death of Christ is confirmed by much other teaching in the New Testament.

In 1 Cor. xv. 22, and more fully in Rom. v. 12-14, Paul asserts that through Adam's sin all men die; or, in other words, that the punishment threatened to Adam

is actually inflicted, apart from any disobedience of their own, upon all his children. Paul goes on to say that through Christ comes a salvation designed for "all" and actually experienced by "many." [Compare the express assertion involved in the future indicative in Rom. v. 17, 19, "will reign," and "the many will be constituted righteous," with the universal purpose asserted in *v.* 18 but without an assertion of actual result, "for all men, for justification of life." See my Commentary.] In my next volume I shall endeavour to show that Paul's teaching implies that through Adam's sin all men not only will die but are born in spiritual bondage, and that through the death of Christ all who believe the good news announced by Him receive spiritual liberation.

We have here a remarkable parallel. Fronting each other stand two men, each of them an avenue of influences reaching to the entire race. These influences, none can evade; but their abiding effect depends on each man's own action. Through Adam all men inevitably go down into the grave: through Christ come actual influences which lay hold of every man, influences which will raise all who obey them from the grave into endless and blessed life. In each case the influence is real and universal: but in each case the abiding result depends upon the man himself.

In this remarkable parallel we read the immense importance, in Paul's thought, of the death of Christ: for we now see that it removes a calamity as wide as the race, and almost as old. It also embodies an

important principle underlying God's government of mankind, viz. the solidarity which makes each man a channel of benefit or injury to others, and which in the two great crises of the world's religious history made one man an avenue through which came death, and another man an avenue of life, for all men. Moreover, the teaching of Paul about the death of Christ removes what would otherwise be a serious objection to an ancient and legitimate inference from the teaching of the Old Testament. That all men die because their father sinned, *i.e.* that the punishment threatened to Adam is inflicted upon all his children, many of whom have not sinned in the likeness of their father's transgression, would, if it were the whole case, contradict our sense of divine equity. The solidarity of the race would then be an injustice to individuals. Paul teaches that it is not the whole case, that we gain through Christ more than we lose through Adam, or rather that no one is permanently a loser through Adam except by his own rejection of the salvation offered by Christ. Seen in the light which shines from His cross, the solidarity of our race is, in spite of the suffering it entails, an immense blessing to the race as a whole, and to every member of it individually except those who persist in a path of sin. That the doctrine of salvation through the death of Christ removes a serious objection to another doctrine resting on a secure foundation independent of the Gospel of Christ, viz. the death of all men through one man's sin, is no small confirmation of the abundant proof, adduced above

that the former doctrine is true. Paul's argument in Rom. v. 12-19, which implies that the aim of the death of Christ was as wide as the result of Adam's sin, also confirms our inference from Rom. ii. 4 that the benefits purchased thereby were designed for all mankind.

The universality of the purpose of salvation through the death of Christ is expressly asserted by Paul in the third group of his epistles. In Phil. ii. 9-11 we read that because Christ was obedient even to death on a cross God exalted Him beyond measure in order that at His name every knee should bow and every tongue confess. Similarly, in Col. i. 20 we read that God was pleased "to reconcile all things to Himself through Christ, having made peace through the blood of His cross." And in Eph. i. 9, 10 we read that God's purpose, "in reference to the administration of the fulness of the seasons," is to gather up under one Head all things in Christ. These passages describe manifestly a purpose of salvation: and they imply clearly that this purpose embraces all men. This purpose is the eternal source of the influence which, as we inferred from Rom. ii. 4, God is exerting on all men. Other abundant teaching of Paul asserts that the accomplishment of this purpose in the case of individuals is only for those who themselves embrace it.

Still more plainly is the universal purpose of the death of Christ stated in the latest group of the Pauline Epistles. In 1 Tim. ii. 1-5 Paul bids that prayer be made for "all men," including kings and those in authority, and gives as a reason that God "desires all

men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth." This he supports by appealing to the "One God and One Mediator of God and men who gave Himself a ransom for all." Similarly in ch. iv. 10: "Saviour of all men, especially of believers." Christ is a Saviour specially of believers, because in them is actually accomplished His purpose of salvation. And, that He is called Saviour of all men, implies that His purpose of salvation embraced all men. In the same sense, in Titus ii. 11 the grace of God is said to be "saving towards all men": *σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις*. These last words, *all men*, found also in Rom. v. 12, 18, 1 Tim. ii. 1, 4, iv. 10, are much more definite than their English equivalent; and include conspicuously the entire race.

The same universal purpose of salvation is clearly stated in the words of Jesus recorded in the Fourth Gospel. In John iii. 16, 17 the Teacher from God declares that God's gift of His only-begotten Son was prompted by love to "the world," and that its aim was that "every one who believes in Him may have eternal life," that thus "the world may be saved through Him." The Son will give His flesh "for the life of the world:" ch. vi. 51. He came that He "might save the world:" ch. xii. 47. In ch. i. 29 the Baptist teaches that Christ is "the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world." Consequently, in 1 John iv. 14 He is called the "Saviour of the world." Still more definitely, in ch. ii. 2, "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but for all the world." These passages,

like those quoted above from the pen of Paul, imply clearly that God's purpose of salvation through the death of Christ embraced all men, and that consequently they who perish do so not because they were excluded by God from His purpose of salvation but simply and only because they refused the offered salvation.

Against the above there is in the Bible nothing to set.

In Eph. v. 25, Acts xx. 28 we read that Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it, and purchased it with His own blood. In John x. 11, 15 Christ declares that He was about to lay down His life for the sheep; and in ch. xv. 13 He compares His love for His disciples to that of a man who lays down his life for his friends. In ch. xi. 52 we are told that He was about to die in order that the scattered sheep of God may be gathered into one. But this limited view of the purpose of the death of Christ by no means contradicts the universal purpose stated in the passages quoted above. Indeed, the limited and the unlimited aspects of the purpose of salvation are stated together in 1 John ii. 2, iv. 9, 14, 1 Tim. iv. 10. In His eternal purpose of salvation Christ foresaw its accomplishment in the actual salvation of so many as He foresaw would accept salvation. These were therefore in a special sense the objects of His purpose. But, inasmuch as God resolved to bring to bear on all men influences which if yielded to will lead each one to salvation, both Christ and Paul speak of the purpose of salvation as universal.

While speaking of the foreseen results of the death of Christ we must carefully avoid the supposition that man's FORESEEN FAITH prompted the gift of Christ. Of this, we have no hint in the Bible. Indeed it is excluded by the teaching of Paul in Rom. iv. 4, Eph. ii. 8, 9, Titus iii. 5 that salvation is by grace, not by works. For, if man's foreseen faith moved God to save, faith would itself be a meritorious act. The teaching of the entire New Testament is that the purpose of salvation was prompted simply by God's pity for ruined man; but that, in resolving to save, God resolved to save, not all men indiscriminately, but only those who should accept salvation. Consequently, salvation is entirely a work and gift of God, but the destruction of the lost is caused only by their own refusal of salvation. Moreover, Paul has now taught us that in order to harmonise this purpose with His own justice God gave Christ to die. If so, Christ died in a special sense for the Church which He had chosen to be His spotless bride; and, in a very real sense, for all mankind.

LECTURE XXIV.

RESULTS ATTAINED.

FROM this point we will review the position gained. In Lect. V. we found evidence which compelled us to believe that the impulse given by Jesus of Nazareth to the religious life of mankind had turned back our race from the ruin into which in His day it was sinking into a path of sustained progress. And we sought information about the teaching of so wonderful a Teacher.

We have also found by abundant and indisputable documentary evidence that as matter of fact the great Apostle who founded the Churches of Europe taught, in phraseology suggested by the Jewish thought of his own day, that God receives into His favour all who believe the good news announced by Christ, that this salvation comes to them through the violent death of Christ, that for this end He deliberately laid down His life, and that the need for this costly means of salvation lay in man's sin. Teaching equivalent to this, but differing altogether in phraseology and in modes of thought, we found attributed to Christ in four memoirs which have come down to us from the first century of

the Christian Church. Similar teaching we found also in some other documents of the same age. This agreement of witnesses amid much diversity of form and detail was to us complete proof that Paul had correctly understood and reproduced the teaching of Christ. It is also evident that these doctrines were accepted by Paul and the other writers of the New Testament with complete confidence, and moulded their entire thought and life.

These results leave us only one alternative. Either the remarkable doctrine of salvation through the death of Christ which we have now traced to the confident belief of the earliest preachers of the Gospel and to the actual teaching of Christ is true ; or, the men who gained for Christ the homage of the world and thus saved it were in DEEP ERROR touching the work of their Master, and the great Master Himself was in error touching His own mission to mankind. Such error is in the last degree unlikely. And its extreme unlikeliness is a very strong presumption that the doctrine believed so firmly by the Apostles and attributed so confidently to Christ is true.

It is already evident that Paul and his colleagues accepted this remarkable doctrine as true because they believed that it had been TAUGHT BY CHRIST. In PART V. we shall find clear evidence that they accepted it as true simply on the word of Christ because they had proof which convinced them that He had risen from the dead. And I shall endeavour to show that this conviction was correct. If so, the attested

resurrection of Christ will be a complete proof of the truth of the doctrine just expounded. We shall believe that He was given up to death for our sins because we have proof that He was raised for our justification.

When we accepted Christ's teaching that He was about to die in order to obtain for men forgiveness of their sins, we at once asked, Wherein lay the need for this costly and mysterious means of forgiveness? This question Paul answers by asserting that God gave Christ to die in order to harmonise with His own justice the justification of believers. This answer we found to be the only conceivable explanation of abundant teaching which we have traced to the lips of Christ; and we found it to be in agreement with what we know about God's moral government of the world. If therefore we accept the unanimous teaching of the New Testament about the death of Christ, we shall accept this explanation of it. And although it presents difficulties which we could not altogether unravel, these difficulties were somewhat lessened by our study of the teaching of the New Testament about the original relation of the Son of God to mankind and to the eternal law of righteousness. Moreover these difficulties did not weaken the documentary evidence that in its broad outlines the teaching of Paul came from the Light of the World.

Teaching practically the same as that expounded above has been held in ALL AGES and in almost ALL Christian CHURCHES. It is a distinctive and conspicuous feature of the Christian religion. All

Christian art and literature bear witness to its all-controlling influence on Christian thought and life. Even in a world where all are doomed to die, a world stained with the blood of martyrs and heroes, the Death of Christ stands without a parallel.

That salvation is offered to all men through the death of One Man for the sins of all, and that His death harmonises with the justice of God the pardon of all who believe His words, reveals not only the innocence of the One Man but His infinite superiority to the many for whom He died. We now ask with wonder, Who is the One Man whose death is the life of all who accept the salvation offered by Him? Who and what is Jesus of Nazareth? An answer to this question is the purpose of the next division of our work.

PART IV.

THE SON OF GOD.

LECTURE XXV.

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRIST.

THE remarkable doctrine, common to nearly all the writers of the New Testament, that Christ died in order that through His death might come to guilty man forgiveness of sins, supplemented as it is by Paul's teaching that the need for this costly means of salvation lay in the justice of God, suggests at once a careful inquiry into the nature of that One Man through whom comes a salvation designed for all men. I shall therefore now endeavour to reproduce the conception of Christ embodied in the Epistles of Paul, in the Fourth Gospel, in the Synoptist Gospels, and in other parts of the New Testament.

In the opening sentence of the Epistle to the Romans we read that the chief matter of the "Gospel of God" is "HIS SON . . . who was marked out as Son of God by resurrection from the dead." The word

rendered *marked-out* or *defined* implies that by this title He was distinguished from others. In Rom. v. 6-10, after appealing to the death of Christ for sinners as a marvellous proof of God's love to them, Paul sums up his argument, that it may be a basis of further argument, in the words, "ye were reconciled to God through the death of His Son." A similar appeal, again made a basis of argument, is found in ch. viii. 32: "He that spared not His own Son, but gave Him up on behalf of us all, how shall He not also with Him give us all things by His grace?" This triumphant argument, and especially the contrast implied in the phrase HIS OWN SON, suggests a father who gives up to peril or death His own Son in order to save others who are not His sons. We have in this passage clear proof that Paul looked upon Christ as the Son of God in a sense not shared by other men. Similarly in Rom. viii. 3 we read that "God sent His own Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin." This refers evidently to the Incarnation; and implies that He who came in human flesh was already the own Son of God. So Gal. iv. 4: "when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of woman, born under law." This teaching implies that, just as a man's sons hold a relation to him shared by no others, so Christ holds a unique relation to God.

The title "Son of God" is also given to Christ conspicuously in 1 Cor. i. 9, xv. 28, 2 Cor. i. 19, Gal. i. 16, ii. 20, Eph. iv. 13, Col. i. 13, 1 Thess. i. 10.

The term *son* suggests at once a mode of DERIVATION. Its application to Christ in a unique sense therefore suggests or implies that He is in some sense derived from the Father, but that His mode of derivation is essentially different from that by which we sprang from the Creator's hands.

The Son of God is also the JUDGE OF THE WORLD; or more accurately the Agent through whom God will judge all men. So Rom. ii. 16: "in the day when God will judge the secret things of men through Jesus Christ." "Before the judgment-seat of Christ" both Paul and all men "must appear:" 2 Cor. v. 10. In close harmony with this, in the address by Paul at Athens recorded in Acts xvii. 31 we read that God "has set a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness in a Man whom He has marked out; whereof He has given assurance to all in that He has raised Him from the dead." The word rendered *marked-out* is the same as that used in precisely the same connection in Rom. i. 4: a remarkable coincidence. That in the great Day all men, even the greatest and best, will stand to be judged by one Man, raises Him infinitely above them.

In Phil. iii. 21 Paul teaches that by His infinite power Christ will at His coming change into the likeness of His own body of glory the bodies of His servants. These words imply unmistakably that Christ will RAISE THE DEAD.

That, as Paul teaches in Rom. iii. 26, the death of one Man renders consistent with the justice of

God the justification of the many who believe His word, proves that not only has the justice of God no charge against Jesus but that in MORAL WORTH He is EQUAL to the multitudes saved through Him. The same is implied in the statement in Rom. v. 10 that, whereas Paul and others were once enemies, they have been "reconciled to God through the death of His Son." So 2 Cor. v. 18-21: "God has reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ. . . . God was, in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself . . . Him who knew no sin He has made on our behalf to be sin." Similar teaching is found in Col. i. 20, Eph. ii. 16, and elsewhere. This teaching places an infinite distance between a race guilty and powerless and Him through whom they who believe His word are restored to the favour and the family of God.

An important corollary from the doctrine of salvation through the death of Christ is given in Rom. v. 12-19, where CHRIST and ADAM are compared as channels of influences, in opposite directions, reaching to all mankind. Manifestly Adam occupies a relation to the race altogether unique. He was the one father of all men. But Jesus was born in the midst of the race, a Son of Man, Himself a descendant of Adam. Consequently, the unique relation to the race asserted for Him in this passage, as much superior to that of Adam as is life to death, must be sought elsewhere than in flesh and blood. It can be found only, as already suggested by other lines of teaching,

in His unique relation to God. A similar comparison meets us again in 1 Cor. xv. 47, where Paul asserts that, whereas the first man Adam is "from earth," the last Adam, the second Man, is "from heaven." This implies that His origin is as much above that of Adam as is heaven above earth.

In the third group of the Epistles of Paul, we read in Col. i. 16, 17 that "in Him were created all things in the heavens and upon the earth, the things visible and the things invisible, whether thrones or lordships or principalities or authorities: all things have been created through Him and for Him. And He is before all things and in Him all things hold together." These words assert that in the hands of the Son of God sprang into being not only the human race but the various ranks of angels, that the entire universe in its various parts was CREATED BY HIS AGENCY and for His pleasure, Himself earlier than all and the bond uniting all into one whole. He is thus earlier and immeasurably greater than the earliest and loftiest in heaven.

In Col. i. 18 Paul goes on to say (as in Eph. i. 22, iv. 16) that the Creator of the universe is also HEAD OF THE CHURCH, which is His body. In other words, He occupies towards all other human servants of God a position of incomparable dignity like that of the head above the other members of a living body. In Eph. v. 23, 24 His relation to the Church is described as that of the BRIDEGROOM who protects to the bride who submits. This comparison implies

that though most closely united to the Church He is personally distinct from and superior to it.

This picture of absolute superiority is maintained in all that Paul says about Christ's relation to the spiritual life of His servants. IN THEM HE LIVES and dwells as the animating principle of their life: Rom. viii. 10, Gal. ii. 20, Eph. iii. 17. THEY LIVE IN HIM as their bulwark and home and vital environment: Rom. viii. 1, 2 Cor. v. 17, Eph. ii. 6. No conceivable relation of one man to another could justify this language. Its use by Paul reveals a conception of Christ infinitely superior to any thoughts of man about man.

The above quotations reproduce very poorly the conception of Christ embodied in the letters of Paul. Only by careful and consecutive study of these letters can we grasp this conception with any approach to completeness. From first to last we find in them no trace of familiarity or of that sense of equality which no human distinctions can altogether obliterate. But we find everywhere profound reverence as for a Master whom to serve is highest honour.

The same portrait of Christ is presented again in the EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. In Heb. i. 1, 2 we read that God who spoke "in the prophets" has now spoken "in the Son." In ch. iii. 5, 6 "Christ as a *Son over* the household" of God is said to have more honour than Moses who was only "faithful *in* all His household, as a *servant*." This contrast implies that Christ holds a position as much superior

to the moral grandeur of Moses as the position of the king's son is superior to the highest and most faithful of the King's servants. In ch. i. 4-14 the writer argues at length that, in virtue of His closer relation to God as His Son, Christ is superior (cp. *v.* 13) to all angels: and upon this superiority is based, in ch. ii. 1-4, an important exhortation. This contrast implies that the title *Son* describes a relation to God and a mode of derivation from God differing in kind from, and infinitely closer than, that by which even the angels were created.

The doctrine of salvation through the death of Christ, involving as we have seen His supreme dignity, meets us frequently, as I have shown in Lect. XX., in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Moreover in Heb. i. 2 we are told, in close and even verbal harmony with Col. i. 17, that through the agency of Christ [δι' οὗ] God made the ages, *i.e.* called into existence the successive ages of history with their contents. And the argument in *v.* 10 implies that the Son of God laid the foundations of the earth and made the heavens.

The Epistle to the Hebrews bears many indications that it was written, not by Paul, but by a writer influenced by his teaching. Its evidence is therefore specially valuable as reproducing a conception somewhat coloured, as all human thought is coloured, by the thought of a writer other than that of the great Apostle. The exact agreement in outline and in some details of diction is additional

evidence that we have correctly reproduced the teaching of Paul.

The teaching expounded in this Lecture has HISTORIC WORTH. For the documents examined prove beyond a shadow of doubt that the greatest and most conspicuous of the early followers of Christ, a man brought up in a city frequently visited by Christ, a former colleague of His murderers, looked upon his contemporary and fellow-countryman as infinitely greater than the greatest of men, greater than the venerated leaders of Israel under the Old Covenant, greater and earlier than the earliest and loftiest archangel, and as occupying a position of unique superiority to everything created and of unique nearness to God. This confident belief of Paul must be accounted for. Moreover, as we shall see still more clearly as we proceed, it involves a modification of man's conception of God, a conception of God new, except in faintest outline in the Old Testament, until the days of Christ and held now only by His followers. We shall be compelled to judge whether, in his conception of the dignity of his Master and of the nature of God, the great Apostle who laid the foundation of European Christianity was in serious error, or whether the unique honour given by Paul to Christ was actually claimed, and claimed justly, by Him.

LECTURE XXVI.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

THE profound reverence of Paul for Christ and the unique claims made for Him by the great Apostle prompt eager search for further information touching Christ's own teaching about Himself. For this search we have, fortunately, abundant materials.

In the Fourth Gospel and in the First Epistle of John, documents manifestly from the same hand, we have a type of teaching differing widely in thought and phraseology from that of Paul. Some of the most conspicuous elements of his teaching, e.g. justification through faith, death and crucifixion with Christ, are altogether absent. Other modes of thought and expression have taken their place. Evidently we have before us a witness independent of the great Apostle to whose testimony we have just listened. Fortunately, also, the new witness gives us a memoir containing numerous and long discourses attributed to Christ. He thus affords materials for verifying the results derived from the writings of Paul.

The importance of this testimony is increased by the abundant evidence, already referred to on p. 120,

that both Gospel and Epistle were written by a beloved companion of Jesus. But this evidence, though affording valuable confirmation, is not essential to my present argument, which rests securely on the complete harmony of the various types of teaching contained in the New Testament.

Paul's profound reverence for Christ finds its counterpart in the Baptist's testimony about Christ and in Christ's testimony about Himself. John speaks of himself in John iii. 31 as "from the earth" and of Christ as from "heaven;" and Christ speaks of Himself to Nicodemus in *v.* 13 as "having come down from heaven." To a Samaritan woman He says in John iv. 10 "if thou knewest the gift of God and who it is that says to thee Give Me to drink, thou wouldst have asked Him and He would have given thee living water." He calls Himself in ch. vi. 33, 35, 41, 48, 50, 51 "the bread of life" and "the living bread which came down from heaven;" and declares in ch. vii. 38 that from those who believe in Him "shall flow rivers of living water." In ch. vi. 45, 46 He asserts that all who have heard the words of God will come to Him, and that He alone has seen God. All that ever came before Him are thieves and robbers; but He is the Good Shepherd: ch. x. 8, 11. To one who spoke (ch. xi. 24, 25) about the resurrection at the last day He said, "I am the Resurrection and the Life." He claims to be "the way and the truth and the life," and that no one comes to the Father except through Him: ch. xiv. 6. And much more in the same strain.

In close agreement with the Epistles of Paul, the Baptist says "I have seen and borne witness that this is THE SON OF GOD:" John i. 34, according to a reading which we may accept with confidence. In *vv.* 50, 51 Jesus accepts from Nathaniel the august title, "the Son of God, the King of Israel;" and from Martha in ch. xi. 27 a similar title, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God." In *v.* 4 He gives to Himself the same title: "that the Son of God may be glorified." In ch. v. 19-23 He frequently speaks of Himself simply as "the Son;" but expounds His meaning more fully in *v.* 25: "the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God." Already in *v.* 17, and afterwards in ch. x. 25, He spoke of God as "My Father." To this as recorded in ch. v. 18, the Jews objected, "He called God His own Father, making Himself equal to God;" and in ch. x. 33, "Thou, being a man, art making Thyself God." And the Evangelist, who often corrects mistaken interpretations of our Lord's words, adds no correction here.

In John iii. 16, 18, and in 1 John iv. 9, Christ gives to Himself the unique title "THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON" of God. The term *begotten* calls attention to the Son's derivation from the Father. And the conspicuous term *only-begotten* teaches that His mode of derivation is unique. Same word in Luke vii. 12, viii. 42, ix. 38, Heb. xi. 17; Tobit iii. 15; Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, l. 872 (or 898). Certainly the Only-begotten Son bears to the Father a relation shared by none else. This title is a stronger version of Paul's phrase, "His own Son." Other teaching in the Fourth Gospel will

leave no room for doubt that Christ claimed a relation to God unique not only among men but in the entire universe.

In other words, all that Paul wrote about Christ as the Son of God we have found, as spoken by Christ Himself, in a document manifestly independent of the Epistles of Paul and written probably by an intimate friend of Jesus.

In John v. 22 Christ claims that "the Father JUDGES no one but has given the whole judgment to the Son." He adds in *v.* 29 that "an hour comes in which all that are in the graves will hear His voice and will go forth, they that have done the good things to resurrection of life, they that have done the bad things to resurrection of judgment." Similarly, in ch. vi. 39, 40, 54 He announces that He will at the last day raise those who believe in Him. We have here a development of the less definite teaching in Phil. iii. 21. This claim to RAISE THE DEAD, not to die again like those raised by Elijah and Elisha as recorded in 1 Kings xvii. 22, 2 Kings iv. 34, 35, but to endless life, not one person but the whole race, has no parallel in human literature. But it is in complete harmony with the claims noted above.

Christ also claims in John viii. 58 to be EARLIER THAN Abraham and than THE WORLD: "before Abraham was, I am." And, speaking to the Father, as recorded in ch. xvii. 5, 24, He says "the glory which I had with Thee before the world was," and "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world."

In very close agreement with Col. i. 16 we read in John i. 3, "all things through His agency began to be, and apart from Him not even one thing began to be which has begun to be." That "the Word" is He who was afterwards known as Jesus Christ, is made quite certain by *vv.* 14-18. The CREATION of the universe in its widest sense is here attributed to the Son of God. And in each case, as in Heb. i. 2, the same grammatical form is used to describe the Son's relation to the created universe: *πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο.* This preposition, so remarkably maintained throughout, notes conspicuously that He is, not the ultimate source, but the mediate source or creating Agent, of the universe.

In John xx. 28, Thomas is recorded to have given to Christ a title perhaps loftier than that of Creator of whatever exists: "my Lord and MY GOD." Yet even this honour Christ accepts: "because thou hast seen, thou hast believed." And in the first verse of the same Gospel we are told that the Word who in the beginning was, and was with God, "was God." It is worthy of note that the exclamation of Thomas was made after the resurrection and in view of clear proofs that He who was then living before the eyes of His disciples had in very truth been nailed to the cross. Perhaps at that moment man for the first time grasped the truth that He who had risen from the dead was indeed a Sharer to the full of the Nature of the Uncreated God.

The whole context of John i. 1 assures us that the title *God* there predicated of Christ denotes all that, to

man's thought, distinguishes God from man, especially the ideas of eternity and infinity. The writer asserts in *v.* 3 that whatever began to be was brought into being through the agency of the Word. This universal assertion defines the term "in the beginning" in *v.* 1. It can be no other than the beginning of whatever began to be. At that time, he tells us, the Son *existed.* But he does not say that then the Word began to be: ἦν; not ἐγένετο, the word used, in *v.* 3, of the universe. He then goes on to say that He who in the beginning was with God was Himself God, and that by His agency the whole universe was made. The only explanation of his words is that the Son existed, without beginning, from eternity. And to Col. i. 16 we can give no other meaning.

This interpretation cannot be overturned by the occasional use of the word *god* in a lower sense, as in Ps. lxxxii. 6, "I have said ye are gods;" and in 1 Cor. viii. 5, "according as there are gods many and lords many." For the word is never so used in the Bible where there is the slightest risk of confounding this usage with its ordinary and loftier sense. The context here, especially the creation of all things by the agency of the Word, removes all doubt about the sense in which the title *God* is given to Christ. Nor can it be set aside by Christ's appeal in John x. 34 to Ps. lxxxii. 6 where the word *gods* is used in a lower sense. For this appeal was evidently designed simply to silence His opponents. He shows at once in *vv.* 35, 36 that He had a claim to the title far higher than had

the men referred to by the Psalmist. Certainly this personal argument does nothing to weaken the proof of higher meaning given in the contexts of John i. 1, xx. 28.

The pre-existence of the Son without beginning is also implied in John xvii. 5, "the glory which I had before the world was, with Thee;" and in *v.* 24, "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world." For companionship and love involve at least two persons. And we cannot conceive this language to describe merely divine foresight of a person who was afterwards to be created.

The title *Son of God* is given to Christ in 1 John i. 7, iv. 10, v. 5, 11, 13, 20, "the Son of the Father" in 2 John 3, and the title *Only-begotten* Son in 1 John iv. 9. In ch. ii. 22, 23 we read, "this is the Antichrist, he that denies the Father and the Son. Every one that denies the Son has not even the Father." These last words make acceptance of Christ's claim to be the Son of God a condition of salvation. Similar teaching in 2 John 9.

In the BOOK OF REVELATION we find Christ occupying a position of supreme dignity in close harmony with the dignity claimed by, and given to, Him in the Fourth Gospel. So Rev. i. 17, "I am the First and the Last;" recalling Isa. xliv. 6, "I am the First and I am the Last, and beside Me there is no God." Similarly Rev. ii. 7, "to him that overcomes *I will give* to eat of the tree of life;" ch. iii. 5, "*I will not blot out* his name from the Book of Life:" and similar language to each of the seven churches. In Rev. ii. 18 Christ calls

Himself "the Son of God;" and in ch. iii. 14 "the Beginning of the creation of God." He occupies a place in the midst of the throne, and is worshipped with exultant praises by those nearest to it and by all the host of heaven. In this rapturous praise the name of the Lamb is closely associated with that of God. And throughout the book Christ occupies the most conspicuous place as an Object of highest honour and worship. Yet the interpreting angel twice (Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 9) refuses worship from John on the ground that he was himself only a fellow-servant; and bids him "worship God." The whole book raises Christ infinitely above the highest and brightest in heaven, and places Him in closest relation to God.

It is now evident that Paul's conception of Christ, a conception unknown to the earlier literature of the world, was shared to the full by the author or authors of the Fourth Gospel, of the First and Second Epistles of John, and of the Book of Revelation. Or rather, in the Fourth Gospel this conception receives a remarkable development in the direction marked out by Paul; and in the Book of Revelation we find a picturesque presentation of the same.

LECTURE XXVII.

THE SYNOPTIST GOSPELS.

IN our endeavour to reproduce the impression made by Christ upon His immediate contemporaries, in order thus to learn His actual teaching about Himself, we come now to a group of three witnesses presenting a third type of New Testament Theology. These witnesses, though each possessing distinctive features, are closely allied, and present a type of teaching differing from both Paul and John much more widely than these differ from each other. As witnesses independent of those already examined, their testimony is of the utmost value.

In the Synoptist Gospels Christ speaks with the authority, unlike that of ordinary teachers, so conspicuous in the Fourth Gospel. He seriously tells His hearers in Matt. v. 17 that He has not come to annul but to complete the Law and the Prophets. He quotes the Decalogue in *vv.* 21, 27, and solemnly adds to it by His own authority an important development: "but I say to you" etc. In Matt. xi. 27 He asserts that He alone and those taught by Him know God. He goes on to call to Himself the weary and heavy-laden and

promises to give them rest by laying upon them His yoke. Yet He speaks of Himself as meek and lowly of heart. And we feel instinctively that these words are true, that Christ's astounding assertions about Himself fall far below His real and incomparable dignity.

The title SON OF GOD, so conspicuous in the two types of teaching already examined, meets us in Luke i. 35 as given to Jesus by an angel before His birth: "He shall be called Son of God." In ch. ii. 49 the Boy speaks to Mary and Joseph about the God of the temple as "My Father." At His baptism a voice from heaven declares, as recorded in Matt. iii. 17, Mark i. 11, Luke iii. 22, "this is My beloved Son." In the temptation, as we read in Matt. iv. 3, 6, Luke iv. 3, 9, the question at issue is whether Christ is "the Son of God." In Matt. xvi. 16, at an important turning-point (*v.* 21) in His teaching, He accepts from Peter with evident approval the great testimony "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

Important evidence touching the meaning in which Christ claimed to be the Son of God is found in the parable of the vineyard recorded in Matt. xxi. 33ff, Mark xii. 1ff, Luke xx. 9ff. After several servants had been ill-used and some put to death, the master resolves to send his son, thinking that his position will secure respect. The servants can be no other than the prophets of the Old Covenant, of whom some were ill-used and put to death. And they must include the greatest of the ancient teachers, men like Moses and Isaiah. Perhaps our Lord has specially in view John

the Baptist. In other words, in this parable Christ claims to be as much above the ancient prophets of Israel, as much above Moses and Isaiah and John the Baptist, as the master's son is, in his relation to the master, above the highest of his servants. His words here are an exact counterpart to the comparison and contrast in Heb. iii. 5, 6. Note also Mark xii. 6, "He had still one beloved son," marking clearly a unique relation to God. The word *son* at once suggests origin. Its use here implies that in virtue of the mode of His derivation from the Father Christ occupies a relation to God shared by no other.

It is now evident that the phrase *Son of God* as a designation of Christ is a conspicuous element common to three chief types of New Testament teaching. It is found in the letters of Paul and in each of the four Gospels. And in all these the conception underlying the term, so far as it can be detected from the context, is absolutely the same. On the other hand, both phrase and conception are, except in faint outline, foreign to the thought and expression of the Old Testament. This remarkable agreement, in a conception altogether new, points clearly to a common source. No fact in the history of human thought is better attested than that both phrase and conception came from Jesus of Nazareth; that, as matter of history, He claimed to be *the Son of God* in a sense implying a unique relation to, and unique mode of derivation from, God.

The Synoptist Gospels represent Christ as again

and again claiming to be the future JUDGE OF THE WORLD. In Matt. vii. 23 He announces that in the great Day He will say to many who have prophesied in His name, "I never knew you; depart from Me, workers of lawlessness." So ch. xiii. 41: "the Son of Man will send His angels, and they will gather out of His Kingdom all the snares and all that do lawlessness and will cast them into a furnace of fire." Notice here that angels are subordinate to Christ and do His bidding. Similarly ch. xvi. 27, "the Son of Man will come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then He will give back to each according to his action." Also ch. xxiv. 31: "He will send His angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they will gather together His elect ones from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." In still bolder colours of awful majesty the great assize is pictured in ch. xxv. 31ff.: "when the Son of Man will come in His glory and all the angels with Him, then He will sit upon the throne of His glory; and before Him shall be gathered all the nations; and He will separate them one from another . . . and He will set the sheep on His right hand and the goats on His left. Then shall the King say . . . come, ye blessed . . . depart from Me, ye cursed."

The above passages, taken in connection with the less abundant and less vivid, but still definite, assertions in the Epistles of Paul and in the Fourth Gospel, are complete historical proof that Jesus of Nazareth claimed that in the day of days, when even the loftiest and best on earth will stand to be judged, Himself will sit in

majesty and pronounce judgment. This is another assured result of our theological research.

Notice carefully that Christ's claim to be in a unique sense the Son of God and His claim to be the future Judge of the world are closely related. Each of them rests on independent evidence of its own. But each claim supports the other. So vast is the difference between the position of the prisoner who trembles at the bar, even though he be innocent, and that of the judge who from his seat of secure authority pronounces judgment, that it is not easy to conceive a mere man, however good, occupying a position of such immeasurable superiority to all other men. But, if there was once on earth a man who stood as much nearer to God and as much above other men as the king's son is in rank above the highest of the king's servants, we wonder not that to Him is committed to pronounce judgment on all mankind.

The picture of the Son of Man sitting in judgment on all mankind has a remarkable Old Testament counterpart in Dan. vii. 13: "behold there came with the clouds of heaven one like a son of man; and he came even to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before Him. And there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him." The Synoptist Gospels contain abundant evidence that Jesus of Nazareth claimed for Himself this august prophecy, and announced its future fulfilment in His return to judge the world.

It is now evident that the supreme dignity given to Christ by Paul and claimed by Him in the Fourth Gospel is, even in many important details, claimed by Him also in the Synoptist Gospels. This convergent testimony is of the utmost importance.

That in the discourses recorded in the BOOK OF ACTS the supreme dignity of Christ is not conspicuous, need not surprise us. For it was all-important in the days and years immediately following the resurrection of Christ to concentrate attention on this one important fact. If men were convinced that the Crucified One had actually risen from the dead, they would easily be led in due time to admit His supreme claims. These claims they would never admit unless they had testimony which convinced them that He had risen. Consequently, in the addresses preserved for us in the Book of Acts, the resurrection of Christ is the one absorbing topic. And on this sufficient ground the Apostles announced forgiveness of sins for all who believe their testimony about Jesus and about the Gospel proclaimed by Jesus. Had they made His superhuman dignity their main assertion, their teaching would have been liable to be misunderstood; and the misunderstanding would have been a most serious hindrance to the spread of the Gospel. The resurrection of Christ, once admitted, is of itself sufficient proof that God receives into His favour all who believe the good news announced by Christ. And with this sufficient proof of their main doctrine, viz. forgiveness of sins through faith in the Crucified, they were content; leaving

the august dignity of their Master for further instruction.

That the EPISTLE OF JAMES, silent as it is about forgiveness of sins through faith in Christ and through the death of Christ, and about the resurrection of Christ, says but little about His supreme dignity, will excite no surprise. Although a most important element of the sacred volume, especially as a moral safeguard against a one-sided presentation of the Gospel, it is the least evangelical part of the New Testament. We notice however that at the beginning of the epistle the name of Christ is linked with that of God: "James a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." And in ch. ii. 1 the object of the Christian faith is "our Lord Jesus Christ, *the Lord* of glory."

The dignity of Christ is not conspicuous in the First Epistle of PETER, which is however very full of evangelical teaching. But throughout the Epistle there is an undertone of marked honour paid to Christ. The Spirit of Christ was in the prophets: ch. i. 11. We are bidden to sanctify the Lord Christ in our hearts: ch. iii. 15. God is to be glorified through Christ: ch. iv. 11. Christians must expect (*v.* 14) to be reproached for the name of Christ. The honour paid to Him is less conspicuous; but not less real.

To sum up. As we studied the Epistles of Paul we felt the profound reverence with which he bowed before Christ as in the presence of One far greater than himself and the greatest of men and we found a complete

counterpart of this reverence in the august claims which in each of the four Gospels He is recorded to have made for Himself. By Paul and in each of the Gospels He is called "the Son of God" in a sense implying a relation to God and a mode of derivation from God shared by no other. Even angels are but servants, and therefore must not be worshipped: He is the Master's Son; and before Him the loftiest in heaven fall prostrate. The meek and lowly One also announced Himself, and by His disciples was accepted, as the coming Judge of the world. Paul contrasts Him with Adam as a second and superior Head of the human race. Paul and John speak of Him as the Creator of angels and of the universe: and the Synoptists speak of the angels as His attendants in judgment. John speaks of Him as God, and records His acceptance of this title, after His resurrection, from one of the Apostles. Such was the impression made by Jesus of Nazareth on His earliest followers.

This conception of Christ implies EXISTENCE WITHOUT BEGINNING. For this is the only explanation of the different relation to the Father and the different mode of derivation from Him, even as compared with angels and men, involved in the ascription to Him, even in contrast to them, of the title Son of God. If by His agency they began to be, whereas of His being there is no beginning, Himself the eternal yet (as we shall see) the derived Companion of God, then may He fitly be called the Son of God while they are but creatures. Thus the title Son of God reveals an ETERNAL SON.

Unlimited existence before time began implies UNLIMITED QUALITIES and powers. Of these I shall say more in the next Lecture. Thus the eternity of the Son involved His infinity. We have here a second point of distinction between the Son of God and those who by His agency were created.

This double distinction between the Son of God on the one hand and men and angels on the other underlies and explains the entire teaching of the New Testament about Christ. If He be a Sharer to the full of the Father's infinite attributes and a Partner of His eternal throne, then is He infinitely nearer to God than the highest archangel. We wonder not that to Him is committed the judgment of the world; and that by His agency the universe was made. And we wonder not that by Thomas and by the author of the Fourth Gospel He was accosted, or spoken of, as God. For their conception of His dignity implies that He shares with the Father two most conspicuous elements of difference between the Creator and His creatures, viz. eternity and infinity. In this sense we may fairly speak of them as believing that CHRIST is DIVINE.

LECTURE XXVIII.

THE SON IS EQUAL TO, AND DISTINCT FROM, THE FATHER.

ALREADY we have found proof that He who was known among men as Jesus of Nazareth was believed by His immediate followers to have made for Himself claims involving existence before the world was and before the earliest archangel, and participation in the eternity and infinity of God. This implies that there is with the Father another eternal Person sharing with Him the attributes of God. We seek now further light touching the relation between these divine Persons as it was understood by the writers of the New Testament.

In this Lecture I shall try to show, defining carefully the terms used, that, in the thought of the first generation of His followers, the Son of God is EQUAL TO, and DISTINCT FROM, the Father; in Lect. XXIX., that He is SUBORDINATE TO the Father; and, in Lect. XXX., that He is ONE WITH the Father.

We have already found in the New Testament language implying that the Son shares the eternity of God and suggesting that He shares also the infinite

attributes of God. In John x. 30 Christ is represented as saying, "I and My Father are One." His enemies at once took up stones to cast at Him, and explained their action by saying, "Thou, being a man, art making thyself God." Yet, instead of disowning their inference, as, if it was incorrect, He was bound to do, Christ merely turns aside the charge by reminding His opponents that in the Old Testament the title *god* was given to some whose claim to it was far less than His own. A similar attempt to kill Christ is explained in ch. v. 18 by the fact that He had "called God His own Father, making Himself equal to God." These last words are apparently the Evangelist's interpretation of Christ's words just recorded. And here again there is no disavowal of the construction put upon them by His enemies. This is the more significant because in the Fourth Gospel several times (e.g. ch. ii. 21, xxi. 23) misinterpretations are carefully corrected. These passages imply that, in some just sense, Christ is "EQUAL TO GOD."

Similarly, in Phil. ii. 6 Christ is spoken of as existing, before "He was made in the likeness of men," in the "form of God." Now *form* is an outward expression of an inward essence. It is that by which we distinguish one object from another. We are here told that before His incarnation Christ existed in a mode of self-presentation which belongs to God, *i.e.* in that mode of self-manifestation which distinguished God from others. Again, form without essence is deception: cp. 2 Tim. iii. 5, "having a form of godliness, but denying the power of

it." Such contradiction of form and essence is inconsistent with the moral dignity of Christ. We therefore infer that He who "existed in the form of God" actually possessed those qualities which distinguish God from His creatures. Our inference is at once verified by the words which follow, which may be literally rendered "the being equal to God." This equality with God, the Son did not look upon as a means of grasping the good things of earth. (See my commentary on the passage.) We have here a clear assumption, in close harmony with the passages quoted above from the Fourth Gospel, that the Son is equal to the Father.

Equality with God is implied in John v. 19, 20: "whatever things He does, these also the Son does in like manner . . . the Father loves the Son and shows to Him all things which Himself does." To do all that the Father does, implies power equal to that of God: and that the Father shows to the Son all that Himself does, implies an intelligence able to comprehend the entire activity of God. Similarly, the words of Christ in John xiv. 9, "he that has seen Me has seen the Father," imply equality with God. For they teach that Christ is an adequate manifestation of God. Still more clearly is equality implied in John xvi. 15: "all things, so many as the Father has, are mine."

These passages help us to understand the phrase *equal to God* as used by John and Paul. For they represent Christ as sharing to the full the infinite power and infinite knowledge of God. And the mention of the love of Christ in 2 Cor. v. 14, Gal. ii. 20 as prompting

His self-sacrifice for man and in Eph. iii. 19 as surpassing human knowledge, taken in connection with His equality in power and knowledge, leaves no room for doubt that, if the teaching of the New Testament be correct, the Son shares to the full that infinite love which is (1 John iv. 8, 16) the essence of God. In this sense, i.e. as comprehending and doing whatever the Father does and as possessing whatever the Father has, and as sharing the infinite love of God to His creatures, and this from eternity, we understand Christ implicitly admitting the charge of His enemies that He was making Himself equal to God. And in this sense they who accept Christ's teaching about Himself as a correct statement of His actual dignity may appropriately speak of Him as divine.

On the other hand, in John xiv. 28 Christ is recorded to say "the Father is greater than I." We shall see in Lect. XXIX. that these words are in complete harmony with those quoted above, and that they set forth another aspect of the eternal relation of the Son to the Father, an aspect needful in order to supplement, and to guard from serious misunderstanding, the conception of the Son of God expounded above.

The equality of the Son to the Father expounded above suggests a further inquiry about the DISTINCTION between the Father and Son as understood by the writers of the New Testament.

It has been suggested that Jesus of Nazareth was equal to God only in the sense that in Him was

manifested, in created human form and life, the full moral grandeur and the wisdom and power of God. In this case we should have not two divine Persons, Companions from eternity, but one created human personality in unique and immediate relation to the One Divine Person. That this was not the conception of Paul and John, will soon appear.

In John i. 1, 14, we read that "in the beginning . . . the Word was with God . . . and the Word became flesh and dwelt among us." The context leaves no room for doubt that by *the Word* is meant the very definite Person afterwards known as Jesus of Nazareth. In other words the writer traces up this well-known personality to the beginning of time, and declares that He then existed "with God." Surely he cannot mean simply that some eternal quality of God, some divine *reason* or *utterance*, as we choose to expound the term *Word*, took personal form in Jesus. For manifestly these introductory words of the Evangelist trace up to the beginning of whatever began to be the illustrious Person who is (ch. xx. 31) the chief matter of the Fourth Gospel.

The personal and eternal distinction of Father and Son is set forth still more clearly in John i. 3: "by His agency all things were made, and apart from Him not one thing was made which has been made." For manifestly the writer's purpose is, not to magnify one special attribute of God as the instrument of creation, but to do honour to Jesus Christ, the Son of God. He asserts in plainest language that all things were made

by the agency of One closely associated with, but other than, the Father.

In close harmony with the above, Paul asserts in Col. i. 16, after speaking of "the Son of His love," who is "Firstborn before every creature," that in Him and through Him and for Him were all things created in heaven and earth. The Apostle goes on to say that "He is the Head of the Church" and "Firstborn from the dead." These words can have no meaning except that through the agency of Him who was afterwards crucified and then raised from the dead were all things created. It is equally evident that the Agent of creation is not here said to be the Father. For indisputably these words were written to confer honour on Christ who is the great matter of this Epistle. In such a connection it would be utterly irrelevant to inform the readers that the universe was created by the Father, or by some special attribute of the Father.

The above passages prove clearly that the two great theologians of the New Testament agree to represent the creation of the universe as wrought by an Agent distinct from the Father. This implies that before the world was, and before time began, there was with the Father One other than Himself yet sharing those powers which called into being whatever began to be.

Again, in John xvii. 5, in prayer to God Christ speaks of "the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." Here are two persons, One speaking to the Other and saying that before the world was these two Persons were possessors of the same glory. In

v. 24, still speaking to the Father, the Son says, "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world." Now love implies necessarily two persons. To love oneself, is practically a contradiction in terms. Or, rather, the term *self-love* is a looser and infinitely lower use of the word *love*. But this lower and looser sense of the word *love* cannot for a moment be tolerated as describing the mutual and eternal love of the Father and the Son. For that love is the divine archetype of Christ's love to us and of our love for each other. So John xv. 9, 10: "as the Father loved Me, also I have loved you: abide in My love. If ye keep My commandments, ye will abide in My love; as I have kept My Father's commandments and abide in His love. . . . This is My commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you." And ch. xvii. 23, 24: "Thou hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me. . . . Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world." This comparison proves indisputably that the Father's love for the Son before the world was is the affection of one Person for another. Thus in the love of the Father for the Son before time began, held up by Christ as the archetype of His own love for man and of the mutual love of His servants, we see reflected the faces of TWO DIVINE PERSONS, the Eternal Father and the Eternal Son.

This distinction of Persons in the Godhead, as expounded in the Fourth Gospel, receives in Matt. xxviii. 19 unexpected confirmation from a widely different document: "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." The Greek idiom

forbids us to infer that these Three have between them only one name. Cp. 1 Cor. vi. 19: "your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit." We should say "your bodies." But the Greeks, where each has only one, used the singular number. In the passage before us the names of the Son and Spirit are placed conspicuously beside that of the Father. This at once suggests that the Son and Spirit are Persons distinct from the Father who is indisputably a Person. And it is in remarkable agreement with the plain teaching of John and of Paul.

The above quotations prove that in the Fourth Gospel divine prerogatives were claimed for Christ and by Christ not on the ground of the close relation of His human nature to the divine nature of the Father, but on the ground of a divine nature distinct from the personality of the Father. They imply that with the Father in eternity is One who shares to the full His infinite power and wisdom and love. And this conception we have found clearly set forth in an epistle which we may accept with confidence as written by Paul and in a memoir of Christ which in the latter part of the second century was everywhere accepted as written by the beloved disciple.

LECTURE XXIX.

THE SON IS SUBORDINATE TO THE FATHER.

WE notice that, although throughout the New Testament the Son of God is raised infinitely above the highest of men and is placed in closest nearness to God, and although language is used about Him which can only be explained as implying eternity and infinity, nevertheless the title GOD is, except in John i. 1 and xx. 28, RESERVED FOR THE FATHER and is used frequently to describe Him even as distinguished from the Son. Paul writes, in 1 Cor. viii. 6, "to us there is one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ." So Rom. xvi. 27: "to the only wise God through Jesus Christ." In John xvii. 3 Christ prays, "that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." In Mark x. 18 Christ says, "none is good except One, even God." Throughout the New Testament we have strict monotheism: and the Father is everywhere spoken of as the one God. This reservation of the supreme title for the Father demands, in view of the equality with God expounded in Lect. XXVIII., careful attention.

Already we have noticed the title SON OF GOD given

to Christ not unfrequently by Himself, by the Baptist, by the Galilean Apostles, and by Paul, as a mark of honour. It is throughout the New Testament the usual term to describe Christ's relation to the Father. Now sonship is essentially a subordinate relation. The very term *Son of God*, in marked contrast to the theological terms *God the Father* and *God the Son*, implies that to the Father belongs the title *God* even as distinguished from the Son; and notes a relation of subordination, as every son is subordinate to his father. This subordination is further seen in that, as we read in John iii. 16, Rom. viii. 3, 32, the Father gives and sends the Son, thus exercising paternal authority.

The subordination of the Son to the Father is very conspicuous in the Epistles of Paul. So 1 Cor. iii. 23, "Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's;" ch. xi. 3, "man is head of woman, and God is the Head of Christ;" ch. xv. 28, "then will also the Son Himself be made subject to Him that did put all things under Him, in order that God may be all in all." This subordination is equally conspicuous in the discourses of Christ recorded in the Fourth Gospel; and receives in them clearer definition. We notice especially Christ's dependence upon, His derivation from, and His unreserved devotion to, the Father. So John v. 19, "the Son cannot do anything of Himself, except what He sees the Father doing; for, whatever things He does, these also the Son does in like manner;" and *v.* 22, "the Father has given to the Son the whole judgment." Notice especially *v.* 26, "as the Father has life in

Himself, in this way also to the Son He has given to have life in Himself;" and ch. vi. 57, "as the living Father sent Me, and I live because of the Father, so he that eats Me shall live because of Me."

These assertions refer not merely to the humanity of Christ in its relation to God but manifestly to the relation of the Eternal Son to the Eternal Father. For the negative assertion in John v. 19 denies to the entire personality of the speaker all self-prompted action. Moreover *v.* 20, "the Father shows Him all things which Himself does," implies an intelligence able to appreciate the entire activity of God, and therefore infinite. The whole chapter suggests, and keeps before us, an essential relation of the Son to the Father. Moreover, in 1 John iv. 9 we read that "God sent His Only-begotten Son into the world" etc.; and in Rom. viii. 3, "having sent His own Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin." This implies that before His human birth He was already the own and only Son of God. Now the term *son* suggests at once, as the chief idea conveyed by it, derivation from one who is called his father. And since, as we have seen, the term *Son of God* describes the relation of the pre-existent Saviour to God, it is impossible to doubt that to this relation refers the assertion in John v. 26.

It may be objected that derivation is inconsistent with existence from eternity, that an Eternal Son or a son as old as his father is a CONTRADICTION IN TERMS. This objection demands careful attention.

All terms used to describe an eternal Person are

necessarily borrowed from what we see in our fellow-men. Indeed from this source are derived all our conceptions of God. Consequently, all human conceptions fall infinitely below the reality of God. Yet they are not on this account altogether erroneous. For we may reasonably infer that whatever in man is good has an infinitely greater counterpart in God. Error arises only when we attribute to God the imperfections and limitations of men.

In the cases of sonship with which we are familiar, viz. sons of human fathers, the bodily nature of the son and to some extent his mental and moral disposition are derived from his father. The son's life is in some sense a continuation of the father's life: but he is nevertheless personally distinct from the father from whom he sprang. Father and son are sharers of the same nature; and are objects, one to the other, of filial and parental love. We notice also that in human life, where both father and son began to be, the son is always many years younger than the father.

We have found in the New Testament the term *Son of God*, suggesting the common ideas just mentioned, used to describe the relation to God of an eternal Person distinct from and subordinate to, and derived from, Him. We now ask, TO WHAT EXTENT MAY WE TRANSFER TO THE SON OF GOD THE IDEAS DERIVED FROM HUMAN SONSHIP?

Evidently in an Eternal Father and an Eternal Son the ideas of older and younger can have no place. As we lift up the conception of sonship out of time into

eternity, these elements of it, ever present in human fathers and sons, at once disappear. When they fall away, does any conception essential to our idea of sonship remain? Yes. There still remains the chief idea, viz. PERSONAL EXISTENCE AND POWERS DERIVED FROM ANOTHER PERSON. And this idea is plainly embodied in John v. 26, and in other express assertions from the lips of Christ describing His own relation to God.

It may be said that derivation itself implies later origin, that it is inconceivable that the derived be as old as that from which it is derived. I do not think so. The sun shines to-day. The rays of the sun may be spoken of as its offspring. The sun which shines to-day shone yesterday, and a thousand years ago. And a thousand years ago similar rays of light went forth from its brightness. It would not be difficult to our thought to conceive the same sun and sunshine ten thousand years ago; or to push back its existence indefinitely into the past. In other words we can think of derivation without any thought of earlier or later. So may we think of Him whose relation to the Father is described in Heb. i. 3 as an "outshining of His glory." To grasp fully this relation is far beyond our powers. But I see nothing incongruous in the conception of an eternal Stream flowing forth from an eternal Fountain. And some such conception is required by the abundant language of Paul and of each of the four Gospels about the relation of Jesus of Nazareth to His Father in heaven.

We may conceive the Father existing from eternity

and possessing infinite powers, simply because He wills so to exist, without any cause external to Himself, ETERNAL AND INFINITE AND UNDERIVED; and of the Son existing with the Father from eternity and possessing to the full the Father's infinite powers, but these received from the Father, existing because the Father wills Him so to exist, ETERNAL AND INFINITE AND DERIVED. This conception will account for the entire language of the New Testament about the Son of God: and I know not of any other conception which will do this.

An exact counterpart of the Son's derivation from the Father, and a very conspicuous element of His subordination, is the Son's DEVOTION TO THE FATHER. Just as from the Father the Son derives all that He has and is, so to fulfil the Father's purposes is the one aim of the entire activity of the Son. This unreserved devotion to the Father finds expression in John iv. 34, "My meat it is that I may do the will of Him that sent Me and complete His work;" in ch. vi. 38, "I have come down from heaven, not that I may do My own will, but the will of Him that sent Me;" and in ch. xvii. 4, "I have glorified Thee in the earth, having completed the work which Thou gavest Me that I may do it." In exact accordance with these passages, we read in Rom. vi. 10, "the life which He lives, He lives for God." Paul means that the entire life of the Risen Saviour is directed to the accomplishment of the purposes of God. And, in this, Christ is (*v.* 11) an example to His servants.

The passages quoted above give to us an harmonious conception of the relation of the Son to the Father. In Him we see an eternal Stream flowing back in full volume to its Source. We see an infinite and eternal Life derived from an infinite and eternal Life, the derived Life being in complete harmony with its source, and tending ever to accomplish the purpose of the original Life. This conception explains the use throughout the New Testament of the phrase Son of God; it accounts for the reservation to the Father, except in two conspicuous exceptions, of the supreme title *God*, and for the frequent subordination, along with a claim to equality, of the Son to the Father.

This eternal relation of the Son to the Father is the simplest explanation of Christ's assertion in John xiv. 28: "the Father is greater than I." That this statement is found in the Fourth Gospel, from which most of the above quotations were taken, suggests at once that the contradiction between it and them is only apparent. The underlying harmony is not difficult to trace. The Son is equal to the Father in everything except that which is conveyed by the terms *Father* and *Son*. He is equal to the Father in that He shares to the full the Father's existence from eternity and His infinite power and wisdom and love. But, inasmuch as the Father possesses these divine attributes from Himself alone, whereas the Son possesses them as derived from the Father, in this real sense and in this sense only the Father is greater than the Son. And this superiority was a reason why the disciples should

rejoice that their Master was going to the Father. For, in harmony with His nature the eternal Stream was ascending to its eternal Source.

As Himself distinct from, and derived from, the Father, the Son is the ETERNAL ARCHETYPE of all created being, and especially of all intelligent beings. We therefore wonder not that He is Himself the Agent of Creation. For in His eternal relation to the Father lay, before time began, the possibility of creaturely existence distinct from and derived from God. The created universe is an unfolding, under the limitations of time, of that which in its germ lay hidden in the derived, yet eternal and unlimited, existence of the Son of God. In this sense, as in Rev. iii. 14, He is "the Beginning of the creation of God.'

The Son of God is not only the archetype, but the PATTERN, of all intelligent creatures. His unreserved devotion to the Father is the model they are bound to imitate. And in proportion as they yield to God the devotion He claims, as did Christ to the full, is the aim of their being accomplished. In other words, in the Godhead and in eternity we find both the archetype and the pattern of all intelligent creatures.

LECTURE XXX.

THE UNITY OF THE FATHER AND THE SON.

IN conspicuous contrast and contradiction to prevalent polytheism around them, all the writers of the Old Testament assert, or assume unmistakably, the unity of God. To them the God of Israel is the one Creator and Controller of the universe and the one Moral Ruler of mankind.

This unity of God is equally conspicuous throughout the New Testament. So Jas. ii. 19: "thou believest that God is one; thou dost well." Similarly Mark x. 18: "no one is good except one, even God." And throughout the New Testament the supreme power in heaven and earth is concentrated in a single hand, that of God our Father. But already we have learnt by strictly historical evidence that the writers of the New Testament agree in believing that with the Father is associated an eternal Companion, a Sharer of His infinite attributes and glory. The relation between this firmly-rooted conception of the divinity of Christ and the equally firmly-rooted conception of the unity of God, as these apparently contradictory ideas were harmonised in the

thought of the writers of the New Testament, demands now careful examination.

Throughout the New Testament the unity of the Godhead resides conspicuously in THE FATHER, even as distinguished from the Son. So 1 Cor. viii. 6: "to us there is one God, the Father." And in ch. xii. 6, after "the same Spirit" and "the same Lord," we have "the same God who works all things in all." At the summit of every scale of ascending being we have one Person, the Father, who bears usually as His sufficient designation the title *God*. The second place in this ascending scale is given to Christ. So 1 Cor. iii. 23: "ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." And ch. xi. 3: "of every man Christ is the Head; and the Head of Christ is God." Still more conspicuously in ch. xv. 28, where we read, touching the final consummation, "then shall the Son Himself be subjected to Him that subjected all things to Him, in order that God may be all things in all."

These quotations and many others which might be added prove that to the thought of Paul the unity of the Godhead resides conspicuously in the Father, that He occupies even in the Godhead a position of unique supremacy, and that, although the Father and the Son and the Spirit are together infinitely above all else, the one supreme place is occupied not by three divine Persons, but by the Father only.

In complete agreement with the teaching of Paul is that of the Fourth Gospel. Even as distinguished from Himself Christ prays in John xvii. 3 to "the only true

God." To the Father as the one Source of all things and the one object of worship and devotion, the Son ever bows. And throughout the Fourth Gospel the unique claims which Christ makes for Himself in no way infringe the unique prerogatives ascribed to the Father.

The unity of the Godhead finds expression also in THE SON. If there is "one God from whom are all things," there is also "one Lord, through whom are all things:" 1 Cor. viii. 6. The universe is one in virtue both of its one ultimate Source and of the one Agent through whom were created all things seen and unseen. And, as we read in Col. i. 18, the one Agent of creation is the one Head of the Church.

Similarly, Christ asserts in John xiv. 6, "no one comes to the Father except through me;" and in ch. v. 22 "the Father judges no one but has committed all the judgment to the Son." In close agreement with this, Christ claims in Matt. xi. 27 that He alone knows God and can reveal God. These last words are a link of close connection between the First and Fourth Gospels. And, throughout the New Testament, whatever the Father does, He does through the Son; and all who would come to the Father must come through the Son. In this unique relation of Christ to the Father we have a second manifestation of the oneness of God.

In 1 Cor. xii. 4 we have a third element of the divine unity, THE ONE SPIRIT who endows various members of the Church with various capacities for Christian work. The full discussion of this third element must be re-

served for another volume. Only by study of the actual Christian life can we understand the nature of the Spirit of God, and the unity of which He is in the hearts and lives of men the Source, and in the Godhead the Completion. We shall find Him to be a third divine Person distinct from the Father but closely related and absolutely subordinate to Him.

It is now evident that in the thought of the writers of the New Testament there were not three Gods but ONE GOD. Not to three divine Persons did they bow as supreme, but to one, viz. the Father who is supreme even in His relation to the Son and the Spirit. Nevertheless, beyond the infinite distance which separates the Creator from even the loftiest of His creatures they saw THREE DIVINE PERSONS, each alone in His own sphere and all united in closest essential harmony: the one Father, the one ultimate Source and ultimate Aim of whatever exists; one Lord, the one Agent of the entire activity of God and the one Head of the Church; and one Spirit, the inward animating principle of whatever lives.

The unity of the Father and Son is further illustrated by remarkable teaching attributed to Christ in the Fourth Gospel. Speaking of His sheep He says in John x. 28 "they shall not perish, for ever; nor shall any one snatch them out of My hand." This he supports by saying that "no one can snatch them out of the Father's hand;" and adds "I and My Father are one," literally are "one thing." Evidently He means that to snatch the sheep out of the shepherd's hand is to snatch them out of the hand of God; and that this

is impossible. The relation between the Father and the Son which makes seizure out of the hand of one to be seizure out of the hand of the other, Christ expressed by saying "I and My Father are one." He thus asserts a relation which arms the Son, in His defence of His servants, with the Father's power.

Teaching still more significant and instructive is found in John xvii. 11, 21-23, where Christ prays that His servants may be one, as Himself and the Father are one. He thus makes the eternal oneness of the Father and Son a pattern of the oneness designed for all the servants of Christ. The comparison involved in the words of *v.* 22, "that they may be one as We are One," not only reveals God's purpose touching His intelligent creatures, but sheds light upon the mysterious relationship of the Father and Son. In using this comparison we must carefully avoid the error of supposing that there is no more in the Divine pattern of unity than in its human counterpart. All that we can fairly infer from it is that whatever God designs His servants to be in the matter of unity, has its perfect archetype in God.

The human side of this comparison finds expression also in John xi. 52: "That the scattered children of God may be gathered into one."

Let us conceive the purpose of our Lord's prayer to be fully attained, as we must believe that it will be attained in the glorified Church in heaven. What may we expect then to find? Personal distinction will remain unimpaired. For, not only has spiritual

growth no tendency to destroy it, but personal distinction is necessary for the manifestation and development of Christian excellence. Consequently, that Christ compares the unity of His followers, for which He prays, to the eternal unity of the Father and Son, goes far to prove that between the Father and the Son there is personal distinction. Otherwise there could be no similarity between the two cases, and the comparison would be meaningless. The unity for which Christ prays is evidently that of perfect harmony, all loving the same objects and cherishing the same purposes, because all will love most that which is most worthy of love, and will purpose only that which is good. Such absolute harmony we must conceive as existing between the Father and the Son; the Son contemplating the entire thought of God, approving it in every detail because it is intrinsically good, making the Father's purposes to be His own, and devoting to their realisation without reserve His own infinite powers. All this is involved in the unity of the Father and the Son. And we have already seen that this unity involves also the Son's participation in the infinite power of God.

Manifestly, the unity of the Godhead DIFFERS from that which Christ desires for His followers, in that, whereas the latter is ACQUIRED, the former belongs to the ESSENTIAL AND UNCHANGEABLE nature of God. From eternity the Persons of the Godhead are One, and cannot be other than one. But this difference by no means mars the comparison. What God is

essentially, Christ prays that His servants may become.

It is worthy of note that in John x. 30, xvii. 11, 21-23, the only passages which assert that the Father and Son are *One*, we have the neuter form ἕν. On the other hand, in Gal. iii. 28, for the unity of believers, we have the masculine ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ. In this last place there was no danger of mistake; and Paul could safely and appropriately use a masculine numeral to describe the living and intelligent unity of His servants. John guards against the error of supposing that the Father and Son are together only One Person by using in each case the neuter form: "I and My Father are One thing."

The harmony expounded above is an outflow of, and is involved in, the Son's eternal derivation from, and subordination to, the Father. For whatever there is in the Son springs from the Father, and returns to Him in ceaseless and unreserved devotion. This involves absolute harmony. For the Stream cannot but be in harmony with its Source.

The following illustration may help us to grasp, in some of its aspects, the conception underlying the various teaching of the New Testament about the Persons of the Godhead. In a firm of manufacturers are three partners. The head of the firm is never seen, on business, outside the office; but, whenever the partners meet in council, he presides. He is the one head of the firm. The second partner transacts business with the outside world. They who wish to

negotiate with the firm must do so through him. No one can set him aside and deal directly with the head, for none can approach him except through his colleague. Thus in this one representative of the firm is maintained its unity in relation to the outer world. The third partner is manager within the factory. No workman can go above him to the second partner or to the head of the firm. All immediate contact with the workmen is reserved for the third partner. Consequently, there is unity in the management. The unity is maintained in the council chamber by the supremacy of the head; in all dealings with the outer world by their reservation to the second partner; and in the management of the factory by its reservation to the third. Thus we have in the entire business life of the firm companionship, order, harmony, and unity. This human analogy, although failing in many points to represent the eternal reality and essential unity of the Godhead, yet helps us to conceive the eternal companionship and order and harmony and administrative unity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

We have now found complete historical proof that the various writers of the New Testament believed without a shadow of doubt or discord that Christ is infinitely greater and nearer to God than the greatest and best of men. This result we reached by a grammatical interpretation of documents which we have traced by strictly historical methods, some to the pen

of the most conspicuous of the early preachers of the Gospel, and all to Christian writers of the first century after the death of Christ.

We have noticed in the various documents of the New Testament widely different types of religious thought and expression. But this difference has only thrown into more conspicuous prominence the ONE DEFINITE AND HARMONIOUS CONCEPTION of the dignity of Christ and of His relation to God which underlies these documents. In this great harmony we have not been able to detect one discordant note. It is true that many details of our conception have been derived from one type of New Testament teaching, the Johannine. But the whole conception is involved in, and is the only explanation of, abundant teaching which we have traced to the pen of Paul. And we have found the same conception underlying the Synoptist Gospels. This complete unanimity in writers differing so widely in their surroundings, their intellectual peculiarities, and their mental power, is one of the most conspicuous features of the New Testament.

In all the documents just mentioned, the title SON OF GOD is claimed by Christ, or is given to Him with profound reverence, as a title of unique dignity, and as noting a unique relation to God. The meaning of this title is determined by the parable of the vineyard given in each of the Synoptist Gospels, by the title *Only-begotten Son* in the Fourth Gospel and in the First Epistle of John, by Paul's appeal to the love of God manifested in the gift of *His own Son* to save men,

and by the contrast in the Epistle to the Hebrews between Moses the faithful servant and Christ the Son of God. This unanimity, in writers so various, compels us to believe that, as matter of historical fact, this august title, and in this sense, was actually claimed for Himself by Christ.

In the Synoptist Gospels Christ is represented as frequently claiming to be the future JUDGE OF THE WORLD; at His bar Paul expected himself to stand; and John represents Him as announcing that His voice will summon to judgment all the dead. John and Paul represent Christ as claiming to be earlier than the world; and assert that BY HIS AGENCY ALL THINGS WERE CREATED. John goes further than the other writers of the New Testament in giving to Him the title *God*, and representing Him as accepting this title from one of His disciples.

Yet, while saying all this about Christ, the writers of the New Testament agree to assert that there is only ONE GOD; and not unfrequently they speak of that one God as the Father, reserving for Him as supreme, even in distinction from the Son, the title *God*. This reservation, which, with two exceptions, is maintained throughout the New Testament, implies that the Son is SUBORDINATE TO THE FATHER. And this subordination is implied in the essentially subordinate title *Son of God*.

The subordination of the Son, and his unreserved devotion to the Father, are very conspicuous in the Epistles of Paul and in the Fourth Gospel. In this last,

the DERIVATION of the Son from the Father is clearly taught by Christ. And, like the idea of subordination, also this more definite conception of derivation is at once suggested by the title *Son of God.* For our idea of a *son* is one who owes His existence to another person called his *father.*

Thus the various writers of the New Testament present one clearly defined picture of the dignity of Jesus of Nazareth and of His relation to God.

This picture, nevertheless, contains manifest marks of DEVELOPMENT. In the Synoptist Gospels we find it in its most rudimentary form. In the Epistles of Paul we find it more fully developed. And in the Fourth Gospel the development is complete. Even within the limits of Paul's letters, and again within the compass of the Fourth Gospel, we can discern development. The statements in Col. i. 16, 17 that the Son existed before all creatures and that these were created by His agency and for Him is far in advance of anything in his earlier Epistles, *e.g.* 1 Cor. viii. 6, "through whom are all things." Christ is recorded to have claimed to be earlier than the world and to be the Only-begotten Son of God. But that He is actually *God*, proclaimed soon after His resurrection by the delighted wonder of Thomas, is first recorded by the mature thought of the Evangelist.

We notice, however, that this development proceeds always on the same lines, that whatever we read about Christ in the Fourth Gospel and in the Epistles of Paul is either a legitimate inference from the teaching of the

First Gospel or is needful in order to give to that teaching unity and intelligibility. Between the pictures given by the different teachers of the New Testament there is no contradiction. They differ only in their degree of definiteness and completeness. Indeed there is much more apparent contradiction between Matt. xix. 17 and xxviii. 19 and between John i. 1 and xiv. 28 than between the teaching of the First Gospel taken as a whole and that of the Fourth.

Possibly the more fully developed teaching of the New Testament about the Son of God may, in its outward form, have been moulded by Gentile modes of thought and expression. Certainly the religious thought of Paul was moulded by his Gentile surroundings: *e.g.* his favourite metaphor of the Body of Christ, compared with the well-known fable of Menenius Agrippa as narrated by Livy, bk. ii. 32. But the complete harmony of all the New Testament writers about the Son of God and the infinite gulf which separates their teaching from all other earlier or contemporary teaching leave no room for substantial contributions from sources external to the sacred nation. Contemporary Greek or Oriental thought does little or nothing to elucidate the teaching of the New Testament about the Son of God.

This teaching involves a NEW AND DEFINITE CONCEPTION OF GOD. Faint indications in the Old Testament of a plurality of Persons in the Godhead have been pointed out. But they are dim and uncertain. The definite and somewhat complex conception of God so clearly portrayed on the many-coloured pages of the

New Testament are altogether different from every conception of God set forth in the entire literature of the world except so far as later literature has been moulded by Christian teaching. It is matter of simple historical fact that the New Testament embodies a complete revolution in man's conception of God.

The only explanation of all the facts of the case is that this new conception of God came from the lips of the great Teacher at whose feet sat, immediately or mediately, all the writers of the New Testament, *i.e.* from the Author of the great religious impulse which turned back from ruin into a new path of progress the entire course of human life. Documentary evidence leaves no room for doubt that He actually claimed to be greater than the greatest of men, and claimed to occupy a unique relation to the universe and to God. This is an assured result of our theological research.

The gradual development of the conception of the Son of God embodied in the New Testament is easily explained. We may suppose that in the Synoptist Gospels we have a correct record of the ordinary public teaching of Christ, and in the Fourth Gospel a record of more private and occasional teaching. In one or both of these forms we may suppose that the teaching of Christ reached Paul: and that in his thought, especially in the quietness of prison life, the conception of the Son of God assumed the form we find in his Epistles. The teaching of Christ was, during His life, very imperfectly comprehended by His disciples. The exclamation of Thomas reveals the light which shone

forth in their hearts from the face of their Risen Lord. And in the introduction to the Fourth Gospel we have the mature thought about the dignity of Christ of one who heard and treasured and pondered His profoundest teaching.

LECTURE XXXI.

THE INCARNATION OF THE SON OF GOD.

IN the foregoing Lectures we have found proof that the writers of the New Testament believed that in the human body of Jesus of Nazareth lived One who existed from eternity as a person distinct from the Father yet in closest relation to Him, the Eternal Son of God. This implies that at the birth of Jesus the Eternal Son, already the Creator of man, entered into a new and very intimate relation to our race. We shall now endeavour to reproduce the teaching of the New Testament about the ENTRANCE of the Son of God INTO HUMAN LIFE and about the relation of the DIVINE and HUMAN ELEMENTS in the Incarnate Son.

In 2 Cor. viii. 9 Paul writes, "ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that because of you He became poor, though He was rich, in order that ye by His poverty may become rich." The wealth laid down can be no other than that of the pre-existent Son. For we have no record or hint that Jesus was ever on earth rich in material good, or that He laid aside such wealth in order to save men. Consequently, the words "became

poor " convey Paul's conception of the act by which the Eternal Son entered human life.

Similarly, in Phil. ii. 6, 7 we read that the Son, although existing " in the form of God," did not look upon His equality with God as a means of self-enrichment, but " emptied Himself." (See my comment on this passage.) That Paul refers to the incarnation, is proved by the words following, ' made in the likeness of men." Consequently the words " emptied Himself" are parallel to " became poor " as a description of the Son's entrance into human life on earth.

The similarity of these phrases is evident. And they imply that the Eternal Son laid aside at His incarnation something in virtue of which He was previously rich and full, in order that what He laid aside we might in some sense and measure gain. We ask now, To what kind of RENUNCIATION does the Apostle refer?

At His human birth the Son of God laid aside His wealth and became poor. Now practically wealth is control over objects needful or pleasant to us; but not necessarily the actual enjoyment of the pleasant things. Not always does the rich man live in luxury: but he is able to do so. And this is the real worth of money. Poverty is the absence of control over things needful or pleasant. The poor man cannot supply his needs or gratify his inclinations. Paul's words imply that at His incarnation the Son not only took upon Him a human body but also laid aside, for a time and for our enrichment, His absolute control over all things, and submitted to creaturely and human limitations in order

that thus by personal experience He might become conscious of human dependence and need. He thus emptied Himself and became poor.

We need not infer from Phil. ii. 6 that the Son laid aside His equality with God. For Paul asserts only that He did not look at this equality as a means of self-enrichment. And we have no hint of change in the essential nature of the Son. For an empty vessel is as perfect in all its parts as a full one. To take away an essential part is not to *empty* but to mutilate. Nor does poverty involve change of character. Frequently a man who has *become poor* has manifested the same intrinsic nobility and the same wealth of goodness as in bygone brighter days. We therefore expect, from these statements of Paul, to find in the incarnate Son no essential change but a change affecting all else except His essential character.

Similar teaching meets us in Heb. ii. 17, from a writer whose modes of thought are closely related to those of Paul: "it behoved Him to be made in all things like to His brethren." The words following suggest that He became like them in order to share their temptations and thus help the tempted. Originally, in His possession of infinite power in contrast to our human weakness, He was beyond measure unlike us. Enthroned above in possession of all good, He seemed to be beyond reach of temptation. He is here said to have placed Himself within reach of it. So Heb. iv. 15: "one that has been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." This teaching is in close harmony with the statement

that, though rich, He became poor in order that we may become rich.

We now turn, as throughout this volume, from the teaching of Paul to that of the Fourth Gospel. In John i. 14 we read that "the Word," which (*v.* 1) in the beginning was, and was with God, and was God, "became flesh." That "the Word" is He who was afterwards known as Jesus of Nazareth, is proved by the whole Gospel, *e.g.*, ch. xx. 31, and especially by the rest of ch. i. 14: "and He pitched His tent among us; and we beheld His glory, glory as of one only-begotten from the Father; He was full of grace and truth." These last words are an important supplement and corrective to Paul's words "He emptied Himself."

The word *flesh* manifestly includes, in Matt. xvi. 17, Rom. iii. 20, xi. 14, 1 Cor. i. 29, etc., all that pertains to humanity. And rightly so. For all human life and thought and effort and achievement are moulded, and in great measure limited, by the conditions of human bodily life. In close harmony with this usage we read in John i. 14 that the Word, not only "came in flesh" as in 1 John iv. 2, but "became flesh." These last words imply that the Eternal Son entered at His incarnation a mode of existence new to Him, and *became* what He *was not* before; that He not only took upon Him human bodily form but accepted the limitations of human bodily life as the mode of His own existence while on earth. This statement is, in spite of complete difference of form and thought, an exact counterpart, from another point of view, to

Paul's assertion that He emptied Himself and became poor.

In close harmony with the above statements is the PICTURE OF THE INCARNATE SON presented to us in the Synoptist Gospels.

In Matt. i. 18, 25, Luke i. 35 we read that Jesus was born, not by ordinary birth, but by an extraordinary putting forth of supernatural power. This SUPERNATURAL BIRTH of Christ is not clearly mentioned or referred to in the rest of the New Testament. We therefore cannot claim it with confidence as part of the Gospel preached by Paul. Nor can we adduce for it the abundant and combined evidence which has compelled us to believe that He claimed superhuman dignity and which will prove to us in PART V. that He rose from the dead. But our proof of the resurrection of Christ will remove all objection to the statements in the First and Third Gospels on the ground that supernatural birth involves an interruption of the ordinary course of nature. Moreover, our proof of the resurrection of Christ will leave no room for doubt that He is, as He indisputably claimed to be, the Eternal Son of God; and that consequently His birth was the entrance of the Eternal Son into human life in order to save from destruction the human race. That so stupendous an event should be accompanied by a special manifestation of superhuman power, is in the highest degree appropriate. So completely in harmony with the unique dignity given to Christ throughout the New Testament is the story of His

birth as narrated in the Gospels that few who concede to Him this dignity will hesitate to accept these narratives as true. We may accept them with perfect confidence.

Profoundly interesting, not only for its picturesque beauty but for the light it sheds upon the condition of the God-Man, is the charming story preserved for us in Luke ii. 41-52 about the youthful Jesus in the temple. He is fully conscious of His unique relation to God; and expresses surprise that Joseph and Mary did not know that He could not but be engaged in the matters of His divine Father. Yet we read that He was making PROGRESS IN WISDOM as well as in stature, and in favour with God as well as with men. This progress implies in the God-Man a human intelligence capable of increasing knowledge. It permits us to believe that, although in the youthful Inquirer dwelt the divine Personality of One to whom from eternity the Father reveals whatever He does, the questions to the teachers in the temple were prompted by a sincere human desire for human instruction.

In Luke iii. 22 we read that at His baptism Jesus RECEIVED THE HOLY SPIRIT. And we cannot doubt that the descent of the Spirit was an impartation to the incarnate Son of powers not previously possessed by Him. The effect of that baptism of the Spirit is soon apparent. Full of the Spirit, Jesus retires from the Jordan; and (ch. iv. 1) is "led in the Spirit in the wilderness." This teaches us that during His life on earth the Son acted under the guidance of the Holy

Spirit. In *v.* 14 we read that He "returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee." The significance of these words we learn from Matt. xii. 28: "if in the Spirit of God I cast out devils." This implies that the miracles of Jesus were wrought in the power, not of Himself as Son of God, but of the Spirit of God. In this respect He is made like to His brethren. Just as they (Acts i. 8) received the Holy Spirit and were thus endowed with superhuman power, so the Son for the same end received the same Spirit. This suggests that during His life on earth the omnipotence of the Son lay dormant; a suggestion in remarkable harmony with the teaching of Paul and John quoted above.

That the DIVINE POWER of the Son was LATENT during His incarnation, is implied or suggested in Matt. xxvi. 53, where, while forbidding Peter to draw sword in His Master's defence, Christ says, "Can I not ask My Father and He will place by My side twelve legions of angels?" Self-defence by His own divine power is left out of sight; manifestly because the exercise of those powers has for a time been laid aside. Similarly, in 2 Cor. xiii. 4 Paul says that Christ "was crucified out of weakness." This I understand to mean that, like the martyrs, He was slain by His enemies because He had not human strength to escape from their hands.

That the youthful Jesus made progress in knowledge, we have already read. And at the close of His career Christ asserts, as recorded in Mark xiii. 32 and pro-

bably in Matt. xxiv. 36, that He DOES NOT KNOW THE DAY of His return. Yet He who says this knew all things from eternity. His words compel us to believe that in some way to us inconceivable because divine the Son of God at His incarnation laid aside for a time and for our salvation the full exercise of His divine intelligence and accepted a pure human mind as the channel of His own knowledge, in order that thus He might know by experience human ignorance and expose Himself to the temptations involved therein. On the other hand, in John ii. 25 we read that "He had no need that one should testify about man; for Himself knew what was in man." And in ch. xxi. 17 Peter says to the risen Lord, with His apparent approval, "Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee." Whether this divine knowledge was that of the Eternal Son or was imparted to the Incarnate Son by the fulness of the Spirit which rested upon Him, the Evangelist does not say. Such blending of divine omniscience with the limitations of human knowledge is what we might expect in the Eternal Word who had become flesh.

In the Fourth Gospel we find in the Incarnate Son evidence of HUMAN EMOTION and especially of sorrow. So John xi. 33, "He was moved with indignation of spirit and troubled Himself;" ch. xii. 27, "now is My soul troubled;" ch. xiii. 21, "He was troubled in spirit and said, One of you will betray Me."

The above scattered notices reveal to us in the God-Man, not only a human body with all human bodily

powers and functions, but a human intelligence and human emotions. At the same time, the whole picture presents only one Person; not a mixture of God and man, but a divine Person living a pure and full human life, able both to say, "Now is my soul troubled," and to speak of the glory which He had with the Father before the world was. This perfect human life, the Eternal Son entered at His incarnation.

This picture of the Incarnate Son sheds light on the statement of Paul and John about the incarnation; and affords materials for an answer to our inquiry about the wealth and the fulness He is said to have laid aside.

We have already seen that Paul's words do not imply that the Son of God laid aside or permitted to become dormant even for a moment anything which pertains to His divine essence; or, in other words, that He laid aside that infinite love which is the essence of God. Moreover, in love are involved all moral attributes. To be untruthful or unjust, is to be unloving. Consequently, the teaching before us does not imply that the Son laid aside or permitted to become inoperative even for a moment any moral attribute. And such suspension of the divine life of the Eternal Son is impossible and inconceivable. "He continues faithful: He cannot deny Himself."

What are sometimes called the NATURAL ATTRIBUTES of God do not stand in the same relation to Him as do the moral attributes just mentioned. The natural attributes are not always in full exercise: they

do not prompt or control every action of God as do His moral attributes. His infinite POWER is put forth only in such manner and measure as His love and wisdom determine. Consequently, to forbear to put forth His full power is not inconsistent with the nature of God. We may therefore conceive the Son of God laying aside for a time and for man's good the full exercise of His divine power, and accepting as the measure of His activity the capacities of human nature, and where these were insufficient for His great mission receiving strength from the Spirit of God. If so, as compared with His complete control over all things in His pre-existent glory, His life on earth was POVERTY; and, as compared with the complete satisfaction of every desire in His pre-incarnate state, it was EMPTINESS.

What I have ventured to suggest about the omnipotence of the Son may with equal probability be extended to His divine OMNISCIENCE. We may explain His growth of knowledge as asserted in the Third Gospel and His ignorance of the day of His return as asserted in the First and Second Gospels by supposing that at His entrance into human life the Eye Omniscient, while preserving unimpaired its capacity for infinite perception, was for a time closed, permitting the Incarnate Son to receive knowledge through the avenue of a human mind enlightened by the Spirit of God. In other words, we may believe that, while retaining in full exercise those moral attributes which are the essence of God, He allowed His

divine power and intelligence to remain for a time dormant, in order that under the conditions of human life on earth He might reveal God to man and work out deliverance for man. This conception of the Incarnation is in harmony with all that we read in the New Testament about the Incarnate Son. And the words of Paul quoted above imply that the self-surrender implied in it was a deliberate and definite act of the Son at His entrance into human life.

The teaching expounded in this Lecture confirms and supplements that of the Lectures foregoing. For the passages quoted from Paul imply the pre-existent wealth and fulness of Him who was known as Jesus Christ. And the Wealthy One cannot be the Father. For we have no hint that He emptied Himself and became poor. Nor is this conceivable. Consequently, the self-emptying implies a pre-existent Person other than the Father. And the Fourth Gospel asserts that the Word existed with the Father long before He "became flesh." Moreover, when we have learnt that Jesus of Nazareth claimed superhuman dignity, we ask at once to what extent He shared our human nature and lived a human life. The various pictures of the incarnate Son in the New Testament agree to represent Him as possessing an intelligence subject to human limitations and a heart capable of human sorrow. In other words, we find there a created and finite, but perfect and pure, human spirit accepted by the Eternal Son as the condition of His life on earth.

Our exposition in outline of the Son of God as depicted in the New Testament is now complete. We have found various types of teaching on this august subject, but all embodying, from different points of view and in different degrees of intellectual development, one fundamental conception. The writers of the New Testament agree to teach, expressly or implicitly, that with the Father from eternity is Another who shares with Him to the full by derivation from Him, whereas the Father is underived, all that He has and is; and that in Jesus of Nazareth this divine Person assumed, in order to save and bless mankind, a perfect and pure human nature and life. This wonderful agreement in so remarkable a conception, a conception unknown till His day, affords decisive evidence that the New Testament embodies correctly the actual teaching of Christ about Himself. For this remarkable unanimity reveals a common source. And this source can be no other than He before whom bow with profound homage all the writers of the New Testament as their Teacher and Lord. That as matter of fact Jesus of Nazareth made for Himself these claims, we may accept as another assured result of our research.

LECTURE XXXII.

THE UNANIMOUS BELIEF OF THE CHURCHES.

OTHER remarkable facts, and another remarkable agreement, now demand attention.

Already we have seen that the writers of the New Testament agree to ascribe to Christ a unique dignity involving a conception of God somewhat complex and till His day unknown. This unanimity finds a wonderful counterpart in the unanimity and persistence with which the belief of the Apostles has in all ages been held fast by the great mass of the followers of Christ. We hear much about theological differences between contending Churches and Schools of Thought. Far more wonderful than these differences is the agreement of nearly all Christians of all Churches in holding fast the teaching of their Master touching Himself and His relation to God. Of this agreement, we have fortunately abundant and easily accessible proof.

In consequence of a controversy kindled by Arius, who asserted (see Socrates, *Church History*, bk. i. 5) that the Son of God did not exist from eternity, but that out of nothing He began to be, Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, summoned to meet at NICÆA,

in A.D. 325, the FIRST ECUMENICAL (or World-wide) COUNCIL of the Church. At this council a creed was drawn up, which was eventually signed by nearly all the members. It is given in a letter to his flock by Eusebius, Bishop of Cesarea, who presided at the opening of the council, a letter inserted by Socrates in bk. i. 8 of his *History*. This creed, quoted by Socrates from Eusebius, is as follows :—

"We believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of all things both visible and invisible; and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, only begotten from the Father, that is, from the essence (*οὐσίας*) of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten not made, of the same essence (*ὁμοούσιον*) with the Father, through whose agency all things were made, both the things in heaven and the things in earth, who because of us men and because of our salvation came down and was made flesh, became man, suffered, and rose the third day, went up into heaven, comes to judge living men and dead men; and in the Holy Spirit. But those who say there was a time when He was not, or He was not before He was begotten, or out of nothing He began to be, or assert that the Son of God is from a different (*ὑποστάσιας ἢ οὐσίας*) substance or essence, or is created, or mutable, or capable of change, these the Catholic and Apostolic Church of God anathematizes."

This creed is in exact agreement with the dignity of Christ and His relation to the Father, expounded in this work as taught in the New Testament. The title

"Son of God" is throughout the New Testament given to Christ as a mark of highest honour. The term "only-begotten" is a conspicuous feature of the Fourth Gospel. The phrases "God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God" express accurately and beautifully the Son's derivation from the Father. The following words, "begotten not made," distinguish between the unique mode of His derivation from the Father and that by which angels and men sprang from the Creator's hands. The phrase "of-the-same-essence-with the Father" (*ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί*), about which there was much contention, suitably describes the Son as sharing with the Father all that He has and is. We have also, in exact verbal agreement with Paul and John, the assertion "through whose agency all things were made." The word "was-made-flesh" reproduces John i. 14. This creed is complete proof that the belief of the writers of the New Testament was firmly held by the Fathers assembled in A.D. 325 at Nicæa.

In spite of this decision the controversy still raged with undiminished intensity for many years, during which time political power was sometimes with the Catholic party, at other times with the Arians. In A.D. 381 the SECOND ECUMENICAL COUNCIL, held at CONSTANTINOPLE, gave a decisive victory to the faith formulated at Nicæa. The Nicene formula, somewhat enlarged and brought into a form practically the same, so far as concerns the matter before us, with the Nicene Creed of the Anglican Prayer Book, was accepted at Constantinople, and has been accepted in all ages and

all Churches as a correct exposition of the dignity of Christ. It is embodied and expounded in "the Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church" (see especially Question 32) adopted by the GRÆCO-RUSSIAN SYNOD at Jassy in A.D. 1643, signed by the Eastern Patriarchs, and approved again by the Synod of Jerusalem in A.D. 1672; and under Question 67 of "the Longer Catechism" of the Russian Church, published in A.D. 1839 by authority of the Holy Synod. The same creed is inserted in the first doctrinal decree of the COUNCIL OF TRENT as "that first principle in which all who profess faith in Christ agree, and the firm and one foundation against which the gates of Hell shall never prevail." It is also prescribed in the bull *Injunctum nobis* of Pope Pius IV. as the universal profession of the ROMAN CHURCH. Thus agree the ancient Churches of the East and the West in their homage to the one Saviour and Lord.

Even this wide agreement is not the whole. While rejecting very much of the teaching of the Church of Rome, the GERMAN and SWISS and ENGLISH REFORMERS clung tenaciously to the doctrines embodied in the Nicene Creed. The first article of the Augsburg confession presented to the Emperor Charles V. by the German reformers begins: "The Churches among us with great agreement teach that the decree of the Nicene Synod about the unity of the divine essence and about the Three Persons is true and is to be believed without any doubt." The Nicene Creed is also accepted in "the Formula of Concord" drawn up and published

by the Lutheran divines in A.D. 1576-84 in consequence of controversies among those who accepted the Augsburg Confession; and it is accepted by all Lutheran Churches. The same teaching about Christ and His relation to God underlies all the Confessions of the Reformed Churches of the Continent. The amended Nicene Creed is recited in the Communion Service of the Anglican Church. The same conception of Christ finds expression in the "Westminster Confession of Faith," which embodies the belief of all the SCOTTISH, ENGLISH, and AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES. And it is held firmly by the CONGREGATIONAL and BAPTIST and METHODIST CHURCHES. In short, except the Unitarians, who during upwards of a thousand years have never been more than a very small fragment of the followers of Christ, the complicated conception of the Son of God set forth in the New Testament and expounded above dominates to-day, and has throughout the eighteen Christian centuries dominated, the entire thought and literature and life of Christendom. Especially has it been in all ages the stimulating faith of nearly all those who have done most to raise the fallen, to build up the Church of Christ, and to carry the Gospel to the heathen.

Several German tribes received Christianity in its Arian form: and at one time it seemed as though the whole German race would become Arian. But this apparent victory of Arianism was only for a time; and eventually the whole German nation accepted the teaching of the great Councils. And since that time

Unitarianism, by which I mean a belief in Christ as the greatest religious teacher of the world which refuses to regard Him as the Eternal Son of God, has never been the belief of a majority of any nation. In our own day a few scholarly, and some very excellent, men reject the historic faith. But their number is proportionately very small, they have been nurtured in the intellectual and spiritual atmosphere of the faith which they repudiate, and they have taken very little part in the abundant evangelistic and philanthropic and missionary activities of our days. Our great religious societies, the organized and private efforts to raise the fallen in Christian countries and to carry the Gospel to the heathen, are supported almost entirely by men who hold fast the belief of the ancient Church. It is not too much to say that, in spite of many differences which separate the various Churches and schools of thought, the teaching about Christ set forth with such marvellous agreement by the various writers of the New Testament has been in all ages, and is in our own day, the confident belief of an overwhelming majority of the professed followers of Christ, and has moulded and raised their entire thought and life.

Not only the dignity of the Son of God and His relation to the Father, but also the relation between the divine Personality of the Son and His human nature, was a matter of serious discussion in the early Church. The SECOND ECUMENICAL COUNCIL condemned the teaching of APOLLINARIS, who asserted that the divine nature of the Son of God took, in the Incarnate Son,

the place of a reasoning soul, admitting in the humanity of Christ only a body and an unreasoning soul. The THIRD GENERAL COUNCIL, held at EPHESUS in A.D. 431, condemned NESTORIUS, Patriarch of Constantinople, who taught that in the Incarnate Son were two distinct Persons. The FOURTH GENERAL COUNCIL, held at CHALCEDON in A.D. 451, condemned the teaching of EUTYCHES that the Son had only one nature, a sort of combination of the divine and human. At this last Council was read a famous letter written two years previously by Leo, Bishop of Rome, to Flavian, at that time Patriarch of Constantinople but since then dead. The teaching of that letter was accepted by the Council and embodied in the DEFINITION OF FAITH which the Council put forth as an authoritative expression of its faith.

This famous definition is as follows :—"Following then the holy fathers, we acknowledge one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and all agree to teach that the same is perfect in Godhead, the same perfect in Manhood, truly God and truly Man, that the same consists of a reasoning soul and a body, of the same essence with the Father according to the Godhead, and that He is of the same essence with us according to the Manhood, in all things like us apart from sin ; begotten before the ages from the Father according to the Godhead, and that in the last days because of us men and because of our salvation the same was begotten of Mary the virgin, the mother of God, according to His Manhood ; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, made known in two natures, without confusion,

without change, without division, without separation; the difference of the natures in no wise removed because of the union, but rather the peculiarity of the natures preserved, and being combined into one Person and one Substance, not as parted or divided into two persons, but in order that the two may become the same Son and Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; according as from the beginning the prophets gave instruction concerning Him, and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself instructed us, and the formula of the fathers has handed over to us."

This Definition of Faith seems to me to be in complete harmony with the harmonious teaching of the New Testament. For the growth in knowledge of the youthful Jesus and our Lord's ignorance of the day of His return reveal clearly in Him a limited, and therefore created, human intelligence distinct from, though mysteriously and closely related to, the omniscience of the Eternal Son. And the complete unity of all that Christ is recorded to say about Himself implies that in Him was only one Person, viz. the Eternal Son who had mysteriously assumed the limitations of human nature. The title *Mother of God*, given to Mary, was adopted and maintained by the fathers at Ephesus and Chalcedon, in opposition to the teaching of Nestorius, as the strongest expression they could find for the undivided personality of the God-Man. And, however inappropriate and offensive it may seem to us, the truth it was designed to assert is of the highest importance. As contradicting the teaching of Nestorius that in Christ

were two persons, and the teaching of Apollinaris that His humanity was destitute of the noblest element of humanity, viz. a reasoning soul, and the teaching of Eutyches that the spirit of Christ was neither divine nor human but a confused mixture of the two, the Definition of Chalcedon is a faithful reproduction of the teaching of the New Testament about the relation of the divine and human in the Incarnate Son of God.

The decisions of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon were rejected by those whom they condemned. And their descendants still exist as the scattered Nestorian Churches of Western Asia and of India, and as the Coptic Church in Egypt and the Armenian Church. With these and similar small exceptions, if they be still exceptions, the Definition of Chalcedon has been approved by almost or quite all theologians who accept the Nicene Creed.

The almost unanimous agreement of the followers of Christ touching the nature of their Lord is one of the most wonderful features in the history of Christianity. That at the early Councils, amid contention and confusion and intrigues which were a disgrace to the Christian name, results were nevertheless attained and formulas drawn up which all subsequent ages have accepted as correct embodiments of all-important truth reveals, above the turmoil of ecclesiastical conflict, the guiding Hand of the great Head of the Church. And I cannot doubt that these formulas, and especially the revised Nicene Creed, have been, in spite of their misuse by some who have made orthodoxy an instrument

of oppression, an infinite enrichment to the Churches and to mankind. For in them saving truth has been handed down in a convenient form from generation to generation.

The wonderful harmony of all Christian Churches in all ages touching the dignity of Christ, in spite of much severe contention on other topics, has already in this volume been traced to the harmonious teaching of the immediate followers of Christ as preserved for us in the New Testament. This later harmony confirms the correctness of our exposition of the earlier teaching. And it is additional proof that this teaching came actually from the lips of Christ. The witness of nearly all His followers in all ages and nations and Churches from His day to our own day is a voice we cannot contradict. No fact in the history of human thought is better attested than that the doctrine of the Son of God as expounded in the foregoing Lectures was the actual teaching of the Author of the great religious impulse which has changed the whole course of human thought and life and saved the world. This will appear still more clearly in our next Lecture.

LECTURE XXXIII.

RESULTS ATTAINED.

WE have noticed that among the many nations and tribes of men the Christian nations occupy a position of conspicuous superiority. Especially have we noticed that to them is confined the marvellous progress which has been so marked a feature of the present century; and that all other nations, except so far as they are receiving aid from Christian countries, are in a state of stagnation or decay. This superiority of the Christian nations we were compelled to attribute to their Christianity. For this is the only element they have in common and as distinguished from the non-progressive nations. We saw that Christianity arose suddenly, between eighteen and nineteen centuries ago; its rise revealing a religious impulse unique in the history of the world. This religious impulse we were compelled, by the unanimous testimony of the earliest Christian literature, to attribute to Jesus of Nazareth. And, looking back to Him through the vista of many centuries and in the light of the state of the world to-day, it became manifest to us that He had turned back the whole course of human life

from the ruin into which in His day it was sinking into a new path of sustained progress.

This marvellous and unique result produced by one man prompted eager inquiry about His life and character and work and teaching. We sought to know by what means He had impressed for good so deep a mark on the history and the present condition of mankind. Fortunately we found on this point abundant and reliable documentary evidence. We found important letters from the pen of the most conspicuous of the early preachers of the Gospel; also a narrative of the founding of the Christian Church, and four memoirs of Christ Himself, all these written, by very different hands, during the first century after His death. And the remarkable agreement of these very different, and in great part independent, witnesses assured us that their testimony is true, that in the New Testament we have a correct picture of Jesus and a correct record of His teaching.

As a moral teacher Jesus gained at once the homage of whatever in us is noblest and best. In His presence even the judge supreme who reigns enthroned in every heart and from whose judgment there is no appeal bowed with lowly reverence. Nay, more. As we listened to His words our moral sense itself became clearer and stronger. His teaching gave us a loftier ideal of what is right and good. And, more even than this, in His character we saw this lofty ideal realised in human life. He became to us the brightest moral light we had ever seen. In other words, as a moral

teacher Jesus of Nazareth spoke to us with an authority we could neither reject nor question.

Jesus asserted frequently and emphatically that exact retribution beyond the grave awaits all men for all actions done in the present life. And He traced this coming retribution to the will of an intelligent Ruler and Maker of man and of the universe, our Father in heaven. These thoughts moulded and coloured His entire moral teaching. Thus our own inferences from the beauty of the material world and its adaptation to man's highest needs, and from the imperfection of retribution in the present life taken in connection with man's deep conviction of the inevitable sequence of sin and sorrow, of virtue and well-being, received wonderful confirmation from the teaching of the Author of the great religious impulse which has changed for good the whole course of human life and history. This confirmation raised our own inferences to complete certainty. Compelled as we were to accept as authoritative the moral teaching of Christ, we were unable to contradict His teaching about God and about the world to come.

These results, however, indisputable as they were, did not supply our deep spiritual need. For we were conscious that we had disobeyed the moral law whose binding authority we could not dispute, and we trembled before the voice of the new Teacher who reasserted in our ears the law already written in our hearts, and threatened punishment for all transgressors. Even the spotless and sublime example of the great Teacher

Himself made us more deeply conscious of our inexcusable shortcomings. Powerless to atone for past sin, and indeed powerless to obey in the future, we turned to the Judge who condemned us and cried for mercy. Our cry was not in vain.

We found in the Epistles of Paul, in addition to much moral teaching, other teaching of a totally different kind He announced, as a chief part of the Gospel He preached, that God receives into His favour all who believe the good news announced by Christ. Teaching equivalent to this, we found attributed to Christ in the Fourth Gospel. And in the Synoptist Gospels we found Him announcing everywhere forgiveness of sins. No historical fact is better attested than that Jesus proclaimed to guilty men good news of pardon. And with remarkable unanimity the various writers of the New Testament assert that forgiveness comes to men through the voluntary death of Christ on the cross.

For these doctrines however, indisputably asserted by Christ, we could find no definite confirmation either in nature or in the moral sense of men; except that they would supply man's deep spiritual need. If we are to accept them, it must be on the word and testimony of the great Teacher. At the same time, the felt authority of His moral teaching and of His lofty example created a strong presumption that He was not in error in this other teaching, bearing as it does so closely on morals. But so vast are the issues at stake that with profound reverence we asked the Nazarene, Who art Thou, and with what right dost

Thou loosen the bond of sin and punishment which the moral sense of man declares to be indissoluble?

In the New Testament our question is abundantly answered. As His words are reported in each of the four Gospels Christ claimed for Himself unique superiority even to the greatest of men and unique nearness to God. And this unique dignity is given to Him everywhere by Paul, and conspicuously in the Book of Revelation. These remarkable claims of Christ involve a new and somewhat complicated conception of God, a conception unknown to human literature and thought till His day. The same teaching about the dignity of Christ and about His relation to God is reproduced, in different degrees of development and under different phraseology, in all the various types of thought in the New Testament. This complete agreement in so remarkable a doctrine is an historical fact demanding explanation.

Another remarkable fact attracted our attention. We found that the agreement of the writers of the New Testament about the dignity of Christ and His relation to God has a wonderful counterpart throughout the Christian centuries and in our own day in the very close agreement of nearly all the followers of Christ in the same belief.

From the above facts we learn that Jesus of Nazareth produced, with or without design, in all His earliest followers whose opinions have come down to us, and through them in nearly all Christians in all succeeding ages up to our own day and in all Churches, a full

conviction that He is infinitely greater than the greatest of men and infinitely nearer to God, and that He gave to their conception of God a new and permanent development. This is an assured result of our theological research.

These results demand explanation. If the harmonious portrait of Christ contained in the New Testament be not correct, either He must have made for Himself claims to which He had no right and which are an infringement of the unique majesty of God, or His immediate disciples have misunderstood altogether His teaching about Himself and about His relation to God.

Now we cannot conceive that Jesus put forth these august and unheard-of claims knowing them to be false. The majesty of His moral teaching and the loftiness of His example forbids the thought of deception on His part.

Scarcely less unlikely is the suggestion that Christ was Himself in serious error touching the nature of God and His own relation to God. For if, being only a man, He believed Himself to be divine, in the sense expounded above, He was a deluded fanatic. Easier far to believe that darkness can give forth light than that a man labouring under so deep a delusion should become to all succeeding generations a bright morning star guiding and cheering the best of men safely amid the gloom of earth along a path which their own moral sense declares to be pure and lofty, Himself a constant incentive to them for all

that is right and good. The suggestion that the great moral Teacher was Himself in serious error about His relation to the moral Ruler of the world may be dismissed as impossible and inconceivable.

Impossible also is the suggestion that the Apostles taught about Christ what they knew to be false. The moral earnestness which glows throughout all the Epistles of Paul and the entire picture of the Apostles given in the New Testament proclaim that he and they were honest men.

Practically the only alternative is either that in very truth Christ is infinitely greater than angels and men or that all His immediate followers misunderstood His teaching about Himself and His relation to God. This alternative, the only one possible, we will now for a moment consider.

If the teaching of the New Testament about Christ be not correct, we must suppose that both the Galilean Apostles and Paul utterly misunderstood the nature of their Master and His relation to God and that they made for Him claims from which He would have recoiled with horror as blasphemy and that they were in serious error touching the nature of God. Yet these men gained for Christ the homage of all succeeding ages: and, had they not done so, He would not have become the Saviour of the world.

Moreover, we must believe that all the early followers of Christ fell into precisely the same complicated error touching their Master and His relation to God. This last supposition is exceedingly unlikely. For,

whereas truth is harmonious, error is always discordant. But amid many outward differences the writers of the New Testament held, as we have seen, one consistent conception about Christ. If we reject this conception as incorrect, we are compelled to believe that this complicated error took so firm hold of the early Christians that it survived unimpaired the great controversies of the early centuries of our era and has continued to our day as the deep conviction of an overwhelming majority of the followers of Christ. And we must believe that this deep yet erroneous conviction has been a strong incentive to good in the hearts of nearly all those who have done most to spread Christianity and to help the spiritual life of man.

Nay, more. There are in our day intelligent and educated men who pay homage to Christ, but refuse to accept the portrait of Him given in the New Testament. If this portrait be incorrect, these men have detected this ancient error, and have grasped a true conception of God. We expect to see in them as the fruit of their important discovery some moral and spiritual superiority to those who are still held fast by the great delusion. We look in vain. For, although long ages ago some who denied the divinity of Christ as expounded above carried the Gospel to heathen tribes, for many centuries past their successors have done very little to extend the domain of Christ, to save the outcast, and to help forward the spiritual life of men.

In short, every hypothesis which denies the truth of the picture of Christ given in the New Testament is surrounded by insuperable historical difficulties.

On the other hand, if the confident belief of the Apostles and of the mass of Christians of all ages be correct, the facts of modern Christendom are explained. If Christ be the Only-begotten Son of God, His birth was by far the greatest event in the history of the world, and Himself infinitely the Greatest of men. We wonder not that His advent was a new era in human history, and that the Gospel which proclaims His unique dignity is a power of God for salvation to all who believe.

The least that can be said is that the facts of Christianity make the supposition that the Apostles were in serious error about Christ little better than a suggestion of despair. And we have proved, by strictly historical evidence, that, unless the Apostles were in serious error, their Master, who is already in a very real sense the Saviour of the world, was infinitely greater and nearer to God than the greatest and best of men. The Apostles' estimate of their Master must be accepted as true unless there are objections to it as serious as the extreme improbabilities involved in its denial.

PART V.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

LECTURE XXXIV.

THE BELIEF OF PAUL.

ALREADY we have seen, in PART II., that Paul believed without a shadow of doubt, and proclaimed everywhere, that God receives into His favour, in spite of their past sins, all who believe the good news of salvation announced by Christ; and in PART III. that he believed that this salvation comes through the violent death of Christ upon the cross. In PART IV. we found proof that Paul accepted these all-important and in great measure new doctrines on the simple authority of Christ because he believed Him to be infinitely greater and nearer to God than men or angels.

We now ask, HOW CAME THE CARPENTER OF NAZARETH TO MAKE UPON THE PUPIL OF GAMALIEL THE DEEP IMPRESSION REFLECTED ON EVERY PAGE OF HIS EPISTLES? What had Christ done so much more

than Paul could do, or than Paul believed that man could do, to lead captive in humble adoration the lofty intelligence of the great Apostle? The answer is not far to seek. Paul tells us at the beginning of his greatest epistle that Jesus Christ "was marked out as Son of God in power . . . by resurrection of the dead;" and his letters contain abundant evidence that his implicit faith in Christ rested upon his firm belief that He had risen from the dead. This evidence I shall now adduce. We shall at the same time inquire in what sense Paul believed that Christ had risen from the dead.

From 1 Cor. xv. 12 we learn that some members of the Church at Corinth, "some among you," denied the general resurrection at the last day. To this denial Paul replies by saying that it involves a denial of the resurrection of Christ; and that this implied denial involves a charge of gross falsehood against himself and his colleagues, and would, if the denial were just, reduce to an empty unreality both the Gospel which Paul preached and his readers' faith. "If Christ be not risen, vain then is our preaching, vain also your faith. Moreover, we are found out to be also false-witnesses of God, because we have borne witness against God that He raised Christ, whom He did not raise, if at least we are to infer that dead men are not raised."

The whole chapter proves that Paul had in view a return to life of DEAD BODIES. For indisputably the resurrection of believers asserted in this chapter will be an uprising in life of bodies laid dead in the grave. So

v. 35, "How are the dead raised? and with what kind of body do they come?" The words in *v.* 43, "it is sown in corruption," can only refer to the decaying body laid in the grave. For this is the only part of those who will be raised in incorruption which can be said to be "sown in corruption." Similarly *v.* 44, "it is sown a soul-governed body, it is raised a spiritual body." The assertion in *v.* 50, "that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does corruption inherit incorruption," teaches plainly that our outward bodily form, inasmuch as it is liable to decay, cannot pass unchanged into the realm of glory. Paul looked forward (*v.* 53) to a time in the future when "this corruptible must needs put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality." And as we have seen, the only corruptible part of the believer is his body.

Now if the resurrection of Christ so conspicuously asserted by Paul had been only a SPIRITUAL though real MANIFESTATION of the Crucified One to His disciples as still living in spirit while His body lay rotting in the grave, his assertion would not have been in any way affected by the denial at Corinth of the bodily resurrection of believers; and consequently it would not have been adduced as an argument to disprove that denial. For to say, to men who denied the possibility of a dead body returning to life, that the spirit of Jesus had in a spiritual manner appeared to His disciples, would be utterly irrelevant.

It is worthy of note that, after speaking of several earlier appearances of Christ to His disciples, Paul

speaks of His appearance to himself, whom he describes as "born out of due time." But the various appearances mentioned in 1 Cor. xv. 5-8 are carefully distinguished from the resurrection of Christ which took place at one definite time. So *vv.* 4, 5: "and that He was buried, and that He rose *the third day*, according to the Scriptures, and that He appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve." Moreover, these appearances are not mentioned again in the Epistles of Paul. In this chapter and elsewhere the whole stress of the argument rests upon the fact that Christ had risen from the dead. Evidently the appearances are quoted simply as evidence of that fact. This proves that Paul had in view a definite return to life and an uprising of the body of Christ laid dead in the grave. The mere survival in life of the spirit of the Crucified could not possibly be described as an event which took place on the third day after His death. No other such event can we conceive except the return to life of the sacred body buried in the garden at Jerusalem.

We have no hint in his Epistles or in the Book of Acts that Paul's belief that Christ had risen rested mainly on his vision on the way to Damascus. In 1 Cor. xv. 5, 6 he mentions, evidently as witnesses of the resurrection of Christ, several men to whom at various times He appeared, in one case five hundred who saw Him at the same time and of whom Paul says that the greater part were still living. Only after speaking of these who saw Him on earth does he refer to the appearance to himself. This suggests that upon

the testimony of these witnesses rested mainly Paul's own belief that Christ had risen. Indeed we can well believe that Paul's frequent contact with Christians, even while persecuting them, afforded him from time to time evidence that the Master in whom the persecuted ones trusted had actually risen from the dead. This evidence would accumulate day by day, and become more and more difficult to resist; until at last the vision on the way to Damascus, supported as it was by much earlier evidence, broke down all opposition and brought the proud Pharisee in humble penitence to the feet of the Persecuted and Risen One. In any case, this chapter leaves no room for doubt that Paul had evidence which convinced him that the body of Christ laid dead in the grave had returned to life.

The same belief finds abundant expression elsewhere. In 2 Cor. iv. 14, the resurrection of Christ is the ground of Paul's sure expectation that himself and his readers will also rise: "He that raised the Lord Jesus will also raise us with Jesus and will present with you." So ch. v. 15: "for Him who on their behalf died and was raised." Inasmuch as Paul was called to his work by the Risen Christ, he attributes in Gal. i. 1 his own apostleship to "God the Father who raised Him from the dead."

Evidence still more important is found in the great Epistle to the Romans. At the beginning of it Paul hastens to pay honour to Christ by saying that He was "marked out as Son of God, in power, by resurrection of the dead." In ch. iv. 24 we read of those

"who believe on Him that raised Jesus our Lord *from the dead*." These last words can be explained only as describing a removal from the grave of the body which lay there among the dead. The same phrase *raised from the dead* is found also in ch. vi. 4, 9 and again in chs. vii. 4, viii. 11, x. 7, 9, and elsewhere frequently. In ch. iv. 25 we are told that God raised Him in order (cp. 1 Peter i. 21) thus to lay a foundation for justifying faith: "He was raised for our justification." In Rom. vi. 5 we are assured that the servants of Christ will be sharers "of His resurrection." In ch. viii. 11, as in 1 Cor xv. 20, 2 Cor. iv. 14, the resurrection of Christ is made a pledge of our own resurrection: "if the Spirit of Him that raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, He that raised Christ from the dead will also make alive your mortal bodies." Notice here definitely the resurrection of the bodies of believers. Belief that Jesus is risen is in Rom. x. 9 made an article of the Christian faith: "if thou believe in thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

As in Rom. i. 4, so in Col. ii. 12 the resurrection of Christ is looked upon as a manifestation of the great power of God: "ye were raised with Him through belief of the energy of God who raised Him from the dead." So Eph. i. 19, 20: "the surpassing greatness of His power towards you that believe, according to the energy of the might of His strength, which energy He put forth in Christ when He raised Him from the dead." Similarly 2 Cor. xiii. 4: "He lives by the power

of God." Now the bodily raising of a dead man would be a wonderful putting forth of divine power and a firm ground of faith in God. Many Christians have felt their need of an inward and spiritual power as much above their own moral strength as the raising of a dead man is above human or natural power; and they have ventured to believe that He who brought forth Christ living from the grave in which He lay dead would give to them spiritual life. But I do not see how the spiritual appearance of a dead man, extraordinary and helpful as such appearance might be as revealing a life beyond the present life, could be described as a putting forth of special power. This being so, these references to the power manifested in the resurrection of Christ confirm the evidence given above that Paul looked upon it as a raising of the dead body of Christ.

The frequent teaching of Paul that believers are or will be "risen with Christ" (*e.g.* Rom. vi. 4, 5, Col. ii. 12, 13, iii. 1, Eph. ii. 5) reveals the strength of Paul's conviction that Christ had risen from the dead. For it shows how powerfully that conviction dominated and moulded his thought about the Christian life.

References to the resurrection of Christ are also found in the earliest and in the latest of his Epistles. So 1 Thess. i. 10, "we wait for His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead;" ch. iv. 14, "if we believe that Jesus died and rose, so also those laid to sleep through Jesus will God bring with Him;"

also 2 Tim. ii. 8: "Jesus Christ raised from the dead."

We notice throughout his Epistles the quiet confidence with which Paul speaks of the resurrection of Christ. There is no strong assertion or attempt at proof. He mentions it with complete confidence as indisputable fact; and frequently uses it as a sure ground of argument. At the same time he is ready to adduce, as in 1 Cor. xv. 5-7, credible witnesses to this everywhere admitted fact. The Epistles of Paul are decisive evidence that without a shadow of doubt and without thought of contradiction he believed that the body of Christ had been raised up from the dead among whom it lay and brought back to life.

This belief explains at once, and is the only explanation of, Paul's profound and conspicuous reverence for Christ as infinitely greater than himself and the greatest of men. If, as we have proved, he believed that He who in the sight of multitudes hung dead on the cross had returned to life, we wonder not that in His presence even Paul bowed with humble reverence. And if he believed that He had come back in triumph from the grave in order to proclaim life for men ready to die, we wonder not that his lowly homage was raised to rapturous devotion. Whatever truth or error underlay this deep conviction, it is the only explanation of Paul's reverence for and loyalty to Christ. Indisputably the entire thought and work of Paul rested upon, and was animated by, his firm belief that the dead body of Christ had risen to life. This

we must now accept as an assured result of our theological research.

A bodily resurrection of Christ implies an ASCENSION TO HEAVEN of the body raised from the dead. For, undoubtedly, when Paul wrote, Christ was no longer living in bodily form on earth. The same is implied in Rom. viii. 34: "Christ who was raised, who is at the right hand of God." So Eph. i. 20, "raised Him from the dead and made Him sit at His right hand in the heavenly places;" also ch. iv. 10, "went up beyond and above all the heavens, that He may fill all things;" and Col. iii. 1, "where Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God." For the mention here of locality suggests irresistibly that the body "raised from among the dead" was also raised to heaven. The bodily presence of Christ in heaven is also suggested by 1 Thess. i. 10, "to wait for His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead;" and especially by Phil. iii. 20, 21, "in heaven, whence we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will transfigure the body of our humiliation conformed to the body of His glory." For we have here definite mention of a glorified body of Christ: and the context implies that His body is in heaven.

Similar teaching is found in the EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. In Heb. xiii. 20 we read that "God led up from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep." In Heb. ix. 24, in contrast to the high-priest who entered "into the holy place once a year with another's

blood," we read that "Christ entered into heaven itself, to appear in the presence of God for us." And in chs. i. 3, x. 12, He is said to have taken His seat at the right hand of God; and in ch. vii. 26 to have "become higher than the heavens."

LECTURE XXXV.

THE BOOK OF ACTS.

PAUL'S serene conviction that in bodily form Christ had risen from the dead, as revealed in his Epistles, receives interesting confirmation from his ADDRESSES as reported in the Book of Acts, a document embodying, as we have seen, the impression made by the teaching of Paul upon the memory and thought of an intelligent and apparently contemporary writer.

In Acts xiii. 30, in an address of Paul at Antioch in Pisidia, we read, "having taken Him down from the timber, they put Him in a grave. But God raised Him from the dead, who appeared for many days to those who went up with Him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are His witnesses to the people." Notice that here, as in 1 Cor. xv. 5-7, Paul appeals for proof that Christ had risen to the testimony of the Galileans. And, as before, he distinguishes the event of the resurrection from the appearances to the disciples. In Acts xiii. 34 Paul adds, "He raised Him from the dead, not again to return to corruption;" and in *vv.* 36, 37 "for David . . . was added to his fathers and saw corruption. But He whom God raised did

not see corruption." We are here told definitely that the body of Christ did not undergo the decay to which all other dead bodies are subject. These words would not be true if the corpse of Jesus had remained dead in the grave.

At Athens, as recorded in Acts xvii. 18, Paul announced as good news "Jesus and the resurrection." In *v.* 31 we have his own words afterwards spoken: "He has set a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness in a man whom He has marked out, of which He has afforded assurance to all, having raised Him from the dead." Here the resurrection of Christ is appealed to in proof that He is the appointed Judge of the world.

Similarly, to Agrippa in Acts xxvi. 23 Paul says "that Christ should suffer, that He first by resurrection of the dead is about to announce light to the people and to the nations."

In close agreement with 1 Cor. xv. 8 we have in Acts ix. 3-6, xxii. 6-8, xxvi. 13-18 three accounts, two of them in reported addresses of Paul, of Christ's appearance to him on the way to Damascus. In each case, Christ is said to have spoken from heaven. This implies that the body of Christ, which is said by Paul in Acts xiii. 37 to have been rescued from corruption, was also raised from earth to heaven. This vision is thus a witness to Paul's belief that the resurrection of Christ had been followed by His ascension.

The belief which finds expression in these addresses

and in the Epistles of Paul, I shall now endeavour to trace to its source in the words and belief of THOSE WHO HAD KNOWN CHRIST DURING HIS LIFE ON EARTH.

In Acts i. 3-8 we read that, after He had suffered, Christ presented Himself frequently and indisputably to His disciples living, that they saw Him and conversed with Him during forty days, that at the close of that time He was before their eyes taken up to heaven. After this they saw Him no more, except that, in close harmony with Rom. viii. 34, Col. iii. 1, Stephen saw Him at the right hand of God and Paul heard His voice from heaven.

In Acts i. 21, 22 Peter declares that it was necessary to elect some one to supply the place of Judas, and to be a "witness of His resurrection." These words indicate the Apostles' conception of the work committed to them.

On the day of Pentecost, in his inaugural address, Peter says of Christ, as recorded in Acts ii. 24, "whom God raised, having loosed the pangs of death, inasmuch as it was not possible that He should be held fast by it." In close agreement with Paul's address recorded in ch. xiii. 36, 37, Peter applies to Christ's resurrection, because they could not be applied to David whose tomb was still in Jerusalem, the words of Ps. xvi. 8-11, "Thou wilt not permit Thy Holy One to see corruption." Peter's words in Acts ii. 31, "neither did His flesh see corruption," show clearly that he believed that the body of Christ had been rescued from the

decay to which even David's body had fallen a prey. He adds with emphasis, "this Jesus God raised, of which we all are witnesses." Manifestly at Pentecost Peter supports the Gospel he preached by appealing to the fact that the dead body of Jesus, whom the leaders of his nation had murdered, had in very truth come forth living from the grave.

To the crowds who, as recorded in Acts iii. 11, thronged Solomon's Porch after the healing of the lame man, Peter spoke similar words: "ye murdered the Leader of Life, whom God raised from the dead, of which we are witnesses." In ch. iv. 2 we are told that the Sadducees and others were specially "grieved because" the Apostles "taught the people and announced in Jesus the resurrection from the dead." On the next day, before his judges, as recorded in *v.* 10, Peter again asserts the same fact: "whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead." On another similar occasion, when again brought before the high-priestly party, as narrated in ch. v. 30, Peter uses similar words: "the God of our fathers has raised Jesus, whom ye slew, having hanged upon timber; this man God raised with His right hand to be a Leader and Saviour."

In Acts x. 34-43 we have a discourse by Peter to Cornelius in which again the resurrection of Christ is mentioned as the chief matter of the Apostles' testimony: "this man God raised on the third day, and gave Him to be made manifest, not to all the people but to witnesses chosen by God, even to us who ate and drank with Him after He had risen from the dead."

Notice here, as in 1 Cor. xv. 4, that the resurrection of Christ is represented as having taken place at a definite time. Thus in each recorded discourse and in each reply before His judges Peter appeals to the fact that Jesus had risen from the dead.

We have now found in the Book of Acts abundant evidence that the courage of those who bore witness for Christ in defiance of the deadly hostility of His murderers was stimulated by their confident assurance that the body nailed to the cross and then laid in the grave had returned to life and risen to heaven; and that this faith was ultimately shared in equal measure by a colleague of His murderers. The faith of Paul is thus traced to the firm belief of those who had known Christ during His public ministry and who gained for Him His first disciples after His death. Indeed only by the faith of the Galileans can we account for the faith of Paul.

In the FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER, which was accepted by all the early writers of the Church as an undoubted work of the Apostle, we have references to the resurrection of Christ as the firm ground of Christian hope. So 1 Peter i. 3: "Blessed be God . . . who according to His great mercy has begotten us again to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." Evidently He means that by raising Christ from the grave God gave to the terrified disciples a new faith and hope which became to them the mainspring of a new life of devotion to Christ. Similarly in *v.* 21: "you

who through Him are believers in God who raised Him from the dead and gave Him glory, so that your faith and hope are in God." Thus this ancient and beautiful epistle gives further expression to the firm faith which found much earlier expression in the speeches recorded in the Book of Acts.

LECTURE XXXVI.

THE FOUR GOSPELS.

WE now turn to the four memoirs which we found occupying in the second century a unique position as authoritative records of the life and death of Christ.

In John ii. 19 Christ is reported to have said "pull down this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." These words are interpreted by the writer (in *v.* 22) to be a reference to His own body and to have been so understood by His disciples after "He was raised from the dead." In ch. x. 15-18 Christ says "I lay down My life for the sheep . . . I lay down My life in order that I may take it again . . . I have authority to lay it down and I have authority to take it again." Read in the light of the belief of later days, these last words suggest at once His resurrection from the dead.

In the Synoptist Gospels, Christ is represented as announcing in plain words that He must needs go to Jerusalem "and be killed, and be raised on the third day." So Matt. xvi. 21, Mark viii. 31, Luke ix. 22, and again Matt. xx. 19, Mark x. 34, Luke xviii. 33; also similar words in Matt. xvii. 23, Mark ix. 31, and plain

references to His resurrection in Matt. xvii. 9, Mark ix. 9. Thus in two passages common to all the Synoptist Gospels, and in two others common to the First and Second Gospels, we have explicit announcements by Christ Himself that He will rise from the dead given in almost the same words except that the First and Third Gospels use the phrase "on the third day" whereas the Second Gospel says throughout "after three days." Whether or not we accept these words as actually spoken by Jesus, they prove that those who on the basis of a common tradition drew up these three Gospels believed that at a definite time shortly after His death Christ rose from the dead.

Each of the four Gospels gives an account of the resurrection of Christ. They agree to assert that one or more women came to the grave and found it empty. The Third and Fourth Gospels say that they came in the early morning of the day after the Sabbath, while it was still dark. The Second Gospel says that the sun had risen. The First Gospel says that they came "late on the Sabbath, as it was dawning towards the day after the Sabbath." These last words are most easily explained, in agreement with the other Synoptists, as describing the early hours of the morning. Strictly, according to the Jewish division of time, "the day after the Sabbath" would begin at sunset. But it is inconceivable that the time previous to sunset could be described as "dawning towards the day after the Sabbath." We must therefore suppose that here the artificial Jewish reckoning which joined the evening to

the next day gave way, as it must ever do in popular thought, to the more natural reckoning which joins the evening to the previous day of which practically it is a part. The early hours of morning are often thought and spoken of as "late;" and they might accurately be described as a "dawning towards" the next day. With this difference of phraseology, the four Gospels agree to represent the women, or at least Mary of Magdala, as coming to the grave in the early hours of Sunday morning.

Each of the four Gospels asserts that the grave was found empty, empty because the Dead One had returned to life. The Fourth Gospel describes with graphic detail the empty grave. And a similar though less full account is given in the Third Gospel; in a passage of which, however, the genuineness is not free from doubt. Each of the Synoptist Gospels tells of a vision of one or more angels who say that Christ has risen. The First Gospel speaks of His appearance to the women who had been to the grave. The Fourth Gospel describes His appearance to Mary of Magdala: and in this it is supported by the supplement to the Second Gospel, undoubtedly a very early document although possibly not written by the Evangelist. The Third Gospel and the supplement to the Second say that Christ appeared to two disciples going into the country. The supplement adds that "afterwards He appeared to the eleven." The Third and Fourth Gospels agree to describe an appearance of Christ to the assembled disciples on the evening following His

resurrection. Moreover, in close agreement with 1 Cor xv. 5, the Third Gospel says that this appearance to the disciples was preceded by an appearance to Peter. These appearances are not mentioned in the First Gospel. But we have there a later appearance of Christ to the eleven Apostles in Galilee. And in close harmony with this we find in John xxi. 1, 2 an appearance of Christ to seven Apostles on the sea of Tiberias. The appearance of Christ to the Apostles a week later than His first appearance to them, as narrated in John xx. 26, and the still later appearances in Galilee as narrated in John xxi. 1, Matt. xxviii. 17, are in harmony with Acts i. 3, which says that the appearances continued "during forty days." They correct an impression which might be received from Luke xxiv. 50 that Christ ascended to heaven on the day of His resurrection. Of this early date of the ascension we have no hint elsewhere in the New Testament.

Thus amid differences of detail, differences easily accounted for by the excitement and confusion of the moment, we have in all our documents substantial agreement. The four Gospels, the Book of Acts, and the Epistles of Paul agree to say that Christ rose from the dead on the second morning after His crucifixion; that on that morning His grave was found empty; that He appeared several times to one or more of His disciples, men or women, in a manner which produced in them complete conviction that His body had returned to life; and that shortly afterwards the body

thus raised from the dead was taken up to heaven. The documentary evidence before us proves that all this was firmly believed by the Apostles, that it was soon afterwards believed by multitudes in the city in which He died, that it became the deep conviction of a friend of His murderers, and of the followers of Christ throughout the world. In other words, as we trace to its source the great religious impulse which has rescued the world from ruin and turned it into a path of sustained progress, we find it inspired by a serene conviction that Christ had trampled death under foot by returning alive from the grave; and this conviction we have traced to Jerusalem and to within a few days of His death.

LECTURE XXXVII.

PROOF THAT CHRIST ACTUALLY ROSE FROM THE DEAD.

BEFORE going on to test the truth of the Apostles' belief that Christ rose from the dead, we will again review the results already gained in our theological research.

In the visible world around us we have found abundant indications that beyond and above it is an unseen and intelligent Creator and Ruler. And in the invisible world of our own inner life and in the social life of men we saw clear indications that beyond the present life exact retribution awaits all men for actions done on earth. This prospect of retribution awoke in us a consciousness of actual personal sin, and a fear of punishment. And even our efforts to do right revealed an inward bondage holding us down under the yoke of sin. We cried out for pardon and for moral liberation. But our cry found no response either in the material world or in our own moral sense or in the observed social life of men.

Other objects soon attracted our attention. We noticed that the sustained progress which is so marked a feature of the present day is, and for long centuries has

been, limited to the Christian nations; and that all other nations, except so far as they are receiving help from Christian nations, are in a state of stagnation and decay. For this remarkable monopoly by the Christian nations of all the higher forms of human good, we could find no assignable cause except their Christianity: for this is the only element they possess in common and as distinguished from other nations. And we sought for the secret of the unique superiority of the Christian religion revealed in the unique superiority of the Christian nations. We found that Christianity arose unexpectedly some eighteen or nineteen centuries ago, that it was due to a unique religious impulse given by a young Syrian artisan to the religious thought of men. And we sought information about so unlikely an Author of an influence so far-reaching, so mighty, and so good.

The moral teaching of Christ, as attested by the earliest Christian documents, we were at once compelled to accept as good in itself and as binding upon us. And the supreme example of Christ claimed the homage of whatever in us is highest and best. We found that Christ spoke frequently about an intelligent and loving Father in heaven and about retribution beyond the grave. Thus our own inferences from the phenomena around and within us received remarkable confirmation both from the indisputable moral authority of Christ and from His unique and good influence upon mankind.

We found also abundant evidence that as matter of fact Jesus of Nazareth announced that all who believe

His good news of salvation are thereby received into the favour of God. In other words, Christ announced forgiveness of sins for all who believe His words. In another volume we shall see that He also promised to put His Spirit in His disciples to be in them the animating principle of a new life of loyalty to God. This wonderful proclamation of pardon and of a new moral life would, we at once felt, supply completely our deep spiritual need, if we ventured, and were justified in venturing, to accept it as true. But this we could not do until we had proof that in very truth it comes from the Author of our being and the Supreme Arbiter of human destiny. The moral dignity of Christ and the wonderful effect of the moral influence exerted by Him raised a very strong presumption that He was not in error in a matter bearing so closely upon morals as the pardon of sin and a new moral life. But so vast are the issues at stake that we hesitated to accept as decisive the word even of Him who has become the Saviour of the world. And with profound reverence we asked the Galilean for the authority with which He dared to break the sequence of sin and death which the Moral Law had bound.

With one voice and with complete confidence, the various writers of the New Testament replied that their Master is infinitely greater than the greatest of men, and occupies a position of unique nearness to God. We soon saw that their teaching about Christ involves a conception of God new to the literature of the world. We noticed that in this somewhat complicated concep-

tion of God and of Christ's relation to God there is, amid different degrees of development, complete harmony between the various and very different writers of the New Testament. And, more wonderful still, we found that their conception of Christ and this new conception of God had survived attacks of contrary beliefs in and around the Church and the Churches which frequently threatened to destroy it or to gain for themselves a position beside it; and that in all ages and all Churches from the days of the Apostles to our own day it has been the cherished conviction of nearly all those who have done most for the spiritual welfare of our race.

These facts compelled us to believe either that Christ actually and justly claimed these august prerogatives or that the men who gained for Him the homage of the world misunderstood utterly His nature and His relation to God; and that they all fell, in spite of many differences in origin and training, into the same startling error touching their Master or conspired to invent and claim for Him a dignity from which He would have shrunk back with horror as blasphemous. The unlikeliness of the various New Testament writers agreeing in the same complicated error forced us to believe that the personal claims attributed to Christ in the New Testament were actually made by Him. On the other hand, the lofty moral teaching and moral dignity of Christ left little room for the suggestion that in His teaching about Himself and about God the most successful Teacher the world has ever known was in

serious error. The extreme unlikeliness of each of these suggestions raised a presumption hardly to be distinguished from certainty that the only possible remaining alternative is the true one, viz. that the picture of Christ contained in the New Testament is correct.

The homage paid to Christ by those who knew Him personally, by the converted Pharisee and persecutor, and by all subsequent generations of His followers, now seen to be indisputable historical fact, demands explanation. How came a young man to make on so many others a lasting impression that He was greater than the greatest of men? The answer is ready. He won their homage as divine because, with or without design, He produced in them a conviction that His body laid dead in the grave had returned to life. Of this assured conviction we have in Lectures XXXIV. to XXXVI. found complete proof. And it accounts abundantly for the reverence and confidence of the early followers of Christ, a confidence which deadly peril could not shake.

We may now accept as proved that Jesus of Nazareth claimed to stand in a relation to God shared by none other, that His disciples accepted this claim with complete confidence because they had no doubt whatever that in bodily form He had risen from the dead, and that this belief was the mainspring of the activity and heroism which gained for their Master the homage of mankind in all future ages and thus saved the world from ruin. The further consequences of these assured results of our inquiry we must next investigate.

This indisputable belief of the Apostles, so far-reaching and so beneficial in its effects, leaves us only one alternative. Either Christ actually and in bodily form rose from the dead or His disciples were in error in their belief that He did so. This alternative we shall best investigate by assuming in turn that the belief of the Apostles was, and was not, correct; and by tracing each of these assumptions to its logical consequences.

IF in bodily form CHRIST actually ROSE FROM THE DEAD, ALL THE FACTS OF THE CASE ARE EXPLAINED. If on the morning but one after His death the grave was found empty in the manner described in each of the four Gospels, if on the evening of the same day as we read in Luke xxiv. 36, John xx. 19, (Mark xvi. 14,) and on other similar occasions and in various places as we read in John xx. 26, xxi. 1, Matt. xxviii. 17, Acts i. 3, Christ showed Himself to His disciples and gave them satisfactory proof that the body which they saw living before them was that which had been nailed to the cross and laid dead in the grave, if as we read in Acts i. 9 they had seen Him rising from earth to heaven, we understand their serene and joyous confidence that their Master had triumphed over death and that He was infinitely greater than the greatest of men. We understand now the transformation of the Apostles' character to which a comparison of the four Gospels with the Book of Acts bears abundant witness. We understand also the fearlessness which enabled them to set at defiance, and by their accusation to goad to desperation, the most powerful party in Jerusalem.

Men who knew, by proofs appealing directly and irresistibly to their senses, that their Master had trampled under foot the tremendous conqueror before whose dread advance the mightiest on earth tremble and bow, and knew that He had commanded them to rescue from death a race doomed to die and had armed them for the discharge of this commission with His own infinite power, might well be fearless. Thus the fact of the resurrection would explain the COURAGE OF THE APOSTLES.

It would also explain their SUCCESS. For any belief is easily accounted for by the truth of that which is believed. If Christ actually rose, doubtless the evidence that He rose was much more abundant than that which is recorded in the New Testament. Doubtless both in their public addresses and in private intercourse the Apostles appealed to many proofs in detail which have not come down to us. That multitudes were convinced, is indisputable. If Christ actually rose, their belief is at once explained.

The CONVERSION OF PAUL is also explained. For the sincerity of his after life compels us to believe that even in his bitter persecution of the Christians he was a sincere servant of God. Moreover we can well believe that his contact with Christians even as their enemy would bring him under the influence of the Gospel and thus help towards his conversion. For, if the testimony of the Galileans was true, evidence of its truth would accumulate from time to time. The clear and honest statements of fact and the straightforward accounts

of Christ and of His teaching given by His persecuted followers before their judges might well impress the sincere and intelligent mind of the young Pharisee. Fresh evidence day by day would strengthen his rising doubts. Thus prepared, the vision on the way to Damascus would at last break down all hesitation and bring the proud persecutor as a humble penitent to the feet of Jesus. Further intercourse, after his conversion, with those who had personally known Him, would banish all doubt and produce complete conviction both that Christ had risen and that He is the own Son of God, a conviction which breathes throughout every page of his epistles. Thus the actual resurrection of Christ would explain the story of Paul.

It would also explain the EFFECT OF CHRISTIANITY UPON THE WORLD. For, if Christ rose from the dead, He is what He claimed to be. If we accept His resurrection as historical fact, we must believe that in Jesus of Nazareth the Eternal Son of God assumed human form in order to save and bless mankind; and that the Gospel is His chosen instrument of salvation. We need not wonder that the Gospel preached by the Apostles, being all-important truth revealed by God to man, survived and spread, in spite of all opposition; and that wherever it has gone it has been a source of manifold blessing. And we need not wonder that the nations which have received it stand to-day immeasurably in advance of all nations which have not received it. In short, if Christ actually came forth living from the grave and showed Himself to the

disciples as narrated in the New Testament, the facts of Christianity and the most conspicuous facts of human history are fully explained. Admit once this central fact, and all others arrange themselves in order around it.

If Christ did not in bodily form rise from the dead, we must suppose either that He DID NOT ACTUALLY DIE or that the Apostles were in error in supposing that they had SEEN ALIVE THE BODY which had been NAILED TO THE CROSS. Each of these suggestions we will now consider.

It is most unlikely that the body of one condemned to die at the instigation of a coalition of the two most powerful parties in Jerusalem would be taken from the cross UNTIL ACTUALLY DEAD. It is also inconceivable that one who had suffered the agonies of crucifixion and had been laid in the grave as dead would, without help, revive. But who would render the help needful to restore one apparently dead? No friend of Christ. For such help could not possibly have been kept secret from His disciples, and would have destroyed the ground of their confidence. Moreover, if He had survived, He would be in a state of extreme weakness. Is it conceivable that a man slowly recovering from wounds which must have drained almost to the point of death His bodily strength could produce upon His disciples an impression that He had trampled death under foot with a triumph so complete as to reveal superhuman power? Certainly the reverent confidence in Christ which gave to His followers, who before His

death had shown no special courage, their almost superhuman courage could not be evoked by any appearance of an invalid still needing most watchful care. We notice also that any such hypothesis leaves unexplained the final disappearance of Christ in a manner which led His disciples to believe that He had risen to the right hand of God. The theory that Christ did not actually die fails utterly and ludicrously to explain the facts of the case.

The only alternative remaining is to suppose that the Apostles were in error in their belief that they had SEEN ALIVE THE BODY LAID DEAD IN THE GRAVE. In this case we must suppose either that the appearances to the disciples existed only in their imagination or that they were produced by a supernatural but only spiritual influence exerted by Christ on the minds of the Apostles. These suggestions we will now consider.

If the body of Christ did not actually come forth living from the grave, the belief which underlay the preaching of the Apostles and the early spread of Christianity was, as I have already proved, a delusion. I shall endeavour to show that on the one hand such a delusion would almost certainly have been detected and that on the other hand it could not account for the indisputable effects of the Gospel.

The likelihood of DETECTION is immensely increased by the strong motive which the most powerful party in Jerusalem had for exposing the error which was spreading in their midst. For, if the bold assertion of the Apostles was true, they who had crucified Christ had

slain the Hope of Israel. They were guilty of the blood not so much of a man as of a nation. For they had destroyed Him who alone could save the nation from impending ruin. If this were once believed by the mass of the people, the lives of the murderers would be in deadly peril. How real was their danger, we learn from Acts v. 26, where the officers sent by the high priest to arrest the Apostles are said to have "feared the people lest they should be stoned." This great danger would make the enemies of Christ most eager to disprove the assertion which was rapidly gaining belief in Jerusalem.

Now if the assertion of the Apostles was untrue and their faith a delusion, there must have been MEANS OF EXPOSING the delusion. If the body of Christ had not returned to life, it must have been somewhere in Jerusalem. It is difficult to disbelieve the testimony of each of the four Gospels that it was buried with honour in a private grave. And it is in the last degree unlikely that it was taken out of that grave. Enemies would not take it secretly: and the courage of the Apostles forbids the supposition that they were guilty of fraud. Even if a resolute scepticism reject the united testimony of the four Gospels and assert that probably the corpse of Jesus was cast into a common trench along with those of the crucified robbers, it is almost certain that the burial place of so notorious a criminal would be known. By opening the grave of Joseph and exposing the carefully buried body, or by opening the trench and exposing the remains of three corpses, the powerful

party which had slain Jesus would at once and for ever put an end to the delusion which was threatening them with destruction.

Even if the body of Christ had vanished from the view both of friends and enemies, His murderers had abundant means of disproving or silencing the assertion that He had risen. For if the Apostles were in error, their testimonies would be contradictory; the contradictions would become apparent, and would expose the delusion. That a plain statement touching simple matter of fact said to have taken place a few weeks ago in their own city survived, in spite of determined and resolute opposition, is strong evidence of the truth of the assertion which no opposition could silence. The survival and spread of the belief that in bodily form Christ rose from the dead cannot be explained except on the supposition that the belief was true.

The conversion of Paul greatly increases the difficulty of supposing that the belief of the Galileans was a delusion. For of his keen intelligence and his well-balanced judgment, and of his former hostility to the Gospel, we have in his epistles (*e.g.* 1 Cor. xv. 9, Gal. i. 13, 14) abundant proof. His hostility would quickly detect the baselessness of a belief resting only on the imagination of unlettered men and women. That instead of detecting it, the pupil of Gamaliel accepted the belief of the fishermen as his own deep conviction, proves that he had evidence which convinced him that Christ had actually risen from the dead and was thus proved to be the hoped-for deliverer of Israel. Evidence sufficient

to convince so intelligent and so resolute an opponent bears on its front the mark of truth.

We have no right to infer that Paul's belief that Christ rose from the dead rested simply or mainly on his vision on the way to Damascus. For the evidence which as matter of fact ultimately produces conviction is often only a small part of the evidence on which the conviction rests. From 1 Cor. xv. 5-7 we learn the care with which Paul had collected evidence that Christ had risen.

Nor can the hypothesis before us explain the EFFECT OF CHRISTIANITY UPON THE WORLD. For the story of Christianity, read in the light of the unique pre-eminence of the Christian nations to-day, reveals the putting forth of unique and superhuman power. Now, as we have seen, the earliest agents of this power with one accord believed without a shadow of doubt that their Master had come forth living from the grave in which He lay dead, and this belief was the mainspring of their activity. That activity saved our race from the ruin into which in their day it was rapidly sinking, and gave to human life a new impulse still bearing abundant proof in the progress of the Christian nations during many centuries past. If Christ did not rise from the dead, that activity, so mighty for good, was prompted by a delusion. If so, in the greatest crisis of human history, the Spirit of Truth has made use of delusion as a means of leading men out of darkness into light; and a delusion, the most intense and wide-spread of all the delusions which have led astray the mind of man, has saved the world.

It has been suggested that in a SUPERNATURAL but PURELY SPIRITUAL way, while His body lay rotting in the grave, the Risen Saviour manifested Himself to His disciples, and thus evoked in them the courage which enabled them to set at defiance the peril involved in proclaiming His messiahship. We need not deny that, even apart from a bodily resurrection, the Spirit of Jesus could so approach and act upon the spirits of His disciples as to produce in them a firm and well-grounded conviction that He was the Conqueror of death and was infinitely greater than the greatest of men. But this supposition will not account for the empty grave, and for the disappearance, beyond reach of identification, of the body of Christ. And it still leaves us in the difficulty of supposing that the faith which saved the world was, touching an important matter of fact firmly believed, only a delusion. For, as I have abundantly proved, the faith not only of the Galileans but of Paul was a conviction that He who appeared to them had come forth living from the grave.

How far from the thought of the writers of the New Testament was the idea of a merely spiritual revelation of Christ to His disciples, is seen in the marked distinction made between the one definite resurrection of Christ on "the third day" and the various subsequent visions. So John xxi. 14, "this third time Jesus manifested Himself to His disciples after being raised from the dead;' and 1 Cor. xv. 4, "and that He was raised the third day . . . and that He appeared to Cephas." Nor will this theory account for the early cessation of

the appearances except as appearances of the ascended Lord. This early cessation of visions which would have been specially encouraging to the disciples while engaged in their arduous and perilous work, demands explanation. It reveals their firm belief that the body raised from the dead which for a time appeared on earth had also been raised to heaven.

Other considerations strengthen the foregoing argument. Practically, the belief that Christ is divine in the sense expounded in PART IV. of this work and the belief that His dead body returned to life stand or fall together. Very few will give to Christ the august dignity claimed for Him by the various writers of the New Testament unless they share their belief that this claim was made good by His bodily resurrection from the dead. As matter of fact, with exceptions too few to mention, all modern writers who deny the bodily resurrection of Christ reject also the teaching of the New Testament about His dignity and His relation to God. The same writers also deny the reiterated teaching of the various New Testament writers that Christ deliberately laid down His life in order thus to win for guilty man a pardon otherwise impossible. Especially do they reject the teaching of Paul that the need for this costly means of pardon lay in the justice of God. And they give a very small place to Paul's foundation doctrine of Justification through Faith.

Modern theological controversy knows ONLY ONE ALTERNATIVE. Either Christ taught these doctrines, and claimed to be in a unique sense the Son of God,

and in bodily form rose from the dead, or the most distinctive features of the teaching of the Apostles are a tissue of errors based upon a series of delusions. In other words we must believe either that Christ rose from the dead or that they who gained for Him the homage of mankind and through whom He became the Saviour of the world were in error not merely touching His supposed resurrection but also touching the Gospel He preached and His relation to God and the nature of God. We must suppose that they made assertions about Him which were utterly untrue; ascribed to Him claims from which He would have shrunk back with horror as blasphemous, and utterly misrepresented His teaching. We must suppose that they held a new and complicated and altogether erroneous conception of God, and that this complicated error has survived to our time as the deep conviction of nearly all those who have done most for the spiritual good of mankind. We must also explain the fact that wherever this complicated tissue of error is not known or is not accepted as true we have helpless stagnation and decay. For in all Christian nations the New Testament is accepted by nearly all religious men as a correct account of Christ and His teaching. In short Christianity itself, both historically and theologically, rests upon the belief that Christ rose from the dead, that He is the Only-begotten Son of God, and that He preached the Gospel set forth in the New Testament. If this belief be not true, modern civilisation and progress are conterminous with a deep delusion.

From the above it is evident that to deny the bodily resurrection of Christ is to accept an alternative which contradicts all the known sequences of human life and to reduce the history of the past into a complex tissue of impossibilities. So terrible an alternative is unworthy of consideration unless there be objections to the belief of the Apostles more serious than those involved in its rejection. What these objections are we shall next consider.

LECTURE XXXVIII.

OBJECTIONS.

WE now ask whether there are objections so serious as to compel us to set aside as a delusion the Apostles' deep conviction that their Master had risen from the dead, a conviction so far-reaching and so beneficent in its effects.

No objection can be built upon any supposed impossibility of some OTHER STATEMENTS IN THE BIBLE. For our argument does not in any way assume the infallibility of the Bible or even its general truthfulness. We have taken the various documents of the New Testament as we should any other written memorials of the past and have tested their statements by the ordinary methods of historical criticism. We found indisputable proof that certain letters were actually written by the Apostle Paul in a form practically the same as that which we now possess. Consequently, apart from the correctness or error of the rest even of the New Testament, these letters are reliable evidence touching the writer's belief. They also bear witness to his well-balanced judgment and high moral character. These letters prove, beyond possibility of doubt, that

Paul had evidence which assured him that the body of Christ laid dead in the grave had returned to life. They also prove that he accepted this belief in middle life, after determined opposition to the faith he afterwards so earnestly preached. In the rest of the New Testament we found complete proof that the belief of Paul was shared by the other early followers of Christ. In other words, apart from any claim to special authority or absolute accuracy, the New Testament contains evidence which proves indisputably that the immediate followers of Christ believed without a shadow of doubt that their Lord had risen from the dead. And I have endeavoured to show that this belief and its effect upon the world can be accounted for only by the truth of that which the Apostles so firmly believed. This argument, inasmuch as it is independent of any special authority of the Bible, is not affected by any unlikeliness of any other statements therein. Each statement must be tested on its own merits.

Nor is the argument invalidated by any DISCREPANCIES, apparent or real, IN THE NARRATIVES OF THE RESURRECTION. For our argument rests primarily, not on the Gospels, but on the indisputable belief of Paul, confirmed as it is by the manifest belief of the other writers of the New Testament; that is to say, not on some one infallible record but upon the substantial agreement of many witnesses. Human testimony affords innumerable examples of discrepancies in detail which cast no doubt whatever upon the substantial truthfulness, in all main outlines, of the statements in which

they occur. In the case before us, discrepancies in detail are easily explained by the excitement of the moment and the wonder of those who had seen the empty grave and believed that they had seen a vision of angels or the Risen Lord Himself. On the other hand, the serene confidence of the Apostles and its effect upon the world can be explained only by the truth of that which they believed. Moreover, the differences of the narratives bear witness to their independence.

Amid many differences we notice, in the narratives of the resurrection and in other New Testament references to it, conspicuous and important POINTS OF AGREEMENT. Each of the four Gospels asserts that on the morning but one after the crucifixion, on the day after the Jewish Sabbath, the grave was found empty by Mary of Magdala and by others, apostles or women. And this is confirmed, as we have seen, by the assertion, in 1 Corinthians and in an address of Peter in the Book of Acts, that Christ was raised on the third day. The First Gospel speaks of an appearance to the women on the morning of the resurrection. The Fourth Gospel and what is perhaps a fragment appended to the Second speak of Christ as appearing the same morning to Mary of Magdala. The Third Gospel speaks of a special appearance to Peter on the same day, followed by an appearance to the Apostles together. In the Fourth Gospel we read of an appearance to the Apostles on the evening after the resurrection. And Paul speaks of several appearances

of Christ to various persons, placing first an appearance "to Cephas, then to the twelve." This general agreement proves that the belief that Christ had risen began, not in Galilee, but at Jerusalem, and within three days of His death. This we must accept as well attested historical fact.

The foregoing argument does not necessarily imply that the Fourth Gospel was written by the beloved Apostle. For, apart from the authorship of the Gospel, our argument is complete. It is therefore not invalidated by any modern critical researches on this subject. At the same time, whatever evidence goes to prove that this Gospel was written by an Apostle strengthens greatly the argument of this volume. And, that it was written by the Apostle John, is supported by evidence which to me is quite conclusive. This evidence, therefore, lends to our argument additional support.

Still less is our argument weakened by modern criticism touching the AUTHORSHIP or DATE of the various books of the OLD TESTAMENT. For it is independent of the Old Testament. Even the references to the Law of Sinai in Lect. IX., which are not necessary to my argument, rest upon secure historical evidence independent of any special authority of the Jewish Scriptures. At the same time, the Old Testament, of which all the books are much earlier than the time of Christ and therefore altogether independent of the teaching of Christ, affords complete proof that the conception of God involved in the New Testament teaching about Christ was, except in dim outline, unknown till

His appearance. This proves that with Christ a new conception of God entered into human thought. Upon this historical fact I have already built an important argument. Moreover the glowing prophecies of the Old Testament about the salvation to come through Israel and to reach to all nations is receiving before our eyes in the spread of the Gospel a wonderful fulfilment. It is true that the mode of the fulfilment differs widely from the expectation of Israel. But that these expectations of world-wide blessing, expectations such as no other nation ever cherished, were more than realised in the Gospel of Christ, reveals the common and superhuman source of the ancient prophecies and of Christianity.

Nor can any possible results of Old Testament criticism INVALIDATE THE AUTHORITY OF CHRIST or the testimony of the Apostles by proving them to have been in error touching the authorship or date of some of the books of the Jewish Canon. For the references in the New Testament to these matters are very few and casual. They are no part of the Gospel preached by Christ and the Apostles. Any slight verbal inaccuracy of Paul in his references to the Old Testament does nothing to explain his firm belief that Christ had risen from the dead and the effect of that belief upon his thought and life and through him upon the world. Still more scanty are the references of Christ, as His words are recorded in the Gospels, to matters of authorship. Even if criticism were to prove that they were in harmony rather with the general belief

of those to whom He proclaimed the word of life than with exact historical fact, the reverent student, in view of the mystery of the Incarnation, would not venture to suggest that such adaptation of the framework of His teaching to the beliefs of His hearers was inconsistent with His Divine authority.

Still less can objection to the foregoing argument be based on certain statements in the Old Testament apparently inconsistent with the findings of MODERN SCIENCE. Indeed, these do not affect even the truthfulness of the documents in which they are found. For a man who accepts popular explanations of natural phenomena, even though they be erroneous, may yet be a reliable witness in matters of direct observation. Nor is our argument affected by the IMPERFECT MORALITY of a few passages in the Old Testament. For such imperfection is in complete harmony with the preparatory nature of the earlier Covenant. Throughout the New Testament we have only the highest moral teaching.

The foregoing are objections to the documentary evidence for the resurrection of Christ. A more serious objection, not to the evidence, but to that which it is adduced to prove, must now be considered.

Not a few modern scholars, some of them careful students of Holy Scripture, and many students of Natural Science, refuse to consider evidence that Christ rose from the dead, on the ground that RESURRECTION OF A DEAD MAN IS INCREDIBLE, AND THEREFORE INCAPABLE OF PROOF. This objection implies that it is much more difficult to believe that a body laid dead

in a grave returned to life than to believe that Christianity with its wonderful effect upon our race is a result of a delusion. This last is at best a suggestion of despair to be tolerated only as a dire necessity. We ask now what are the cogent reasons which have compelled its advocates to accept it.

Almost all who put forward this plea of incredibility shelter themselves more or less under the already-mentioned discrepancies in the accounts of the resurrection. But their main objection rests on other grounds.

The objection usually takes the form of a denial of the POSSIBILITY OF MIRACLES. And miracle is usually defined as "the suspension of law," as "a contradiction of the universal law, a breaking through the natural connection of cause and effect," *i.e.* as something contrary to the observed order of nature according to its fixed laws. We are reminded that all religions are adorned with a legendary halo of miracle, that the history of the Christian Church for many centuries is surrounded by miraculous stories similar to those of the New Testament, but that in every case the halo has been dispersed by historical investigation. And it is suggested that the miracles narrated in the Bible must all share the same fate.

In this work I have said nothing about miracles as such. The only event mentioned by me and differing from the ordinary course of nature is the resurrection of Christ. For the historical reality of this event, I have adduced evidence which even those who reject it admit to be strong. It will therefore be well to leave

out of sight for the present all other miracles. Each of these must be tested by its own evidence. On the other hand, if the argument of this work be accepted as conclusive, all antecedent objection to miracles as in themselves impossible will be removed. Our only concern now is to defend against the objection before us the one miracle to which above all others the Apostles appealed in proof of the truth of the Gospel.

It is said that the return to life of a dead body would CONTRADICT THE OBSERVED ORDER OF THE MATERIAL WORLD, that upon this invariable and recognised order rest all science and philosophy and material progress, and that to admit the possibility of its interruption would cast confusion on the best attested inductions of mankind, and would destroy that confidence in the constancy of nature which underlies all human thought and action. This objection assumes that since the world began nothing has happened differing essentially from the order of nature as observed in our own day and in historical time; and that there are no forces or Power operating, or capable of operating, on matter except those which reveal themselves in uniform operation day by day in the various phenomena of the material world.

The assumption underlying this objection might perhaps be admitted if the OBSERVED FORCES OF NATURE or the observed sequences of cause and effect accounted for all observed phenomena. But this, as in Lect. II. we have already seen, they cannot do. They CANNOT ACCOUNT even FOR THEMSELVES.

Their complexity proves that they are not original: and they cannot say whence they came. Nor can they account for MOTION. For, as we saw, the forces inherent in matter, such as gravitation, chemical affinity, etc., all tend ultimately to equilibrium. Had there been no forces or impulse other than these, equilibrium would never have been disturbed. Consequently, motion itself reveals some primal impulse which we have no reason to suppose has been repeated. Still less can natural forces explain or account for the ORIGIN OF LIFE. The transition from the lifeless to the living is utterly unlike all the observed sequences of nature and utterly inconceivable in its mode; and thus reveals the operation of a force or Power altogether unlike the observed forces of nature. By producing life, this Higher Power changed completely the aspect of our planet, gave to it a beauty and interest before unknown, and thus created a new era in its history. And the wondrous garment of life which now clothes and adorns the once lifeless world reveals the operation of a Power vastly greater than the forces which manifest themselves day by day in inorganic or organic matter.

The advent of this new Power by no means implies even a moment's SUSPENSION OF THE FORCES already operating. Doubtless before life began the forces of gravitation, heat, chemical affinity were operating according to the laws since observed by men. We must conceive that in the midst of these forces a new force began to work, drawing together already existing chemical atoms into new combinations, arranging them

into cells, and endowing them with the functions of life; and thus in some measure neutralizing, or at least modifying the action of, the earlier forces at work in organic matter, and producing phenomena altogether new. But the earlier forces continued in operation and limited and modified the development of the newly-formed living bodies. These last are controlled, to take one example, by gravitation. Yet this force is, in turn, counteracted whenever we catch a falling ball. But, while doing so, the effect upon our hands and arms tells that the force of gravitation is still in operation. Similarly our bodies are affected by heat and light and by the absence of these. Life itself is dependent on chemical affinities. Yet the vital force within us neutralises chemical forces which otherwise would dissolve, and after death will dissolve, our bodies. In other words, in the origin of life we have no suspension, even for a moment, of the forces already at work in inorganic matter; but we have the entrance among these pre-existent and still operating forces of a new and higher Power producing phenomena utterly unlike all previous phenomena.

We notice that the new force, although quite different from the already operating forces of inorganic matter, works in complete HARMONY with them; and gives to them and to inorganic matter, as a necessary basis of this new development, a significance without which they would be meaningless and worthless. This harmony reveals the common origin of the lifeless and the living.

In the history of our planet we can trace the advent of another new force much later in its appearance than the origin of motion or of life, and like them creating a new era. Possibly or probably the varieties of living forms have been in great part or altogether developed, by the operation of constant forces, from simpler forms. But between the instincts of the highest brutes and the MORAL SENSE AND CAPACITY FOR IMPROVEMENT OF even the lowest MEN is a broad line of demarcation which no influence known to be at work in animals can pass. In man as distinguished from animals are faculties which cannot be accounted for by the influence of environment or by survival of the fittest. Moreover the analogy of history does not favour the supposition that the earliest races of men were the lowest. We have no example of a savage tribe rising, unaided, into civilisation. If this happened in the early morning of our race we have a phenomenon then quite different from everything observed since the memory of man.

In a world peopled hitherto only by brutes appeared reasoning man. Possibly the dawn of reason was gradual. But of this we have no indication. In any case, his appearance reveals the operation of a Power higher than the influences already at work in animal life; a Power itself intelligent and moral. Yet, as before, the advent of the new force did not suspend for a moment the operation of already existing forces. Reasoning man is still subject to the laws of animal life, even while living a life infinitely higher than that of animals. As before, the advent of this new force

created a new era in the history of our planet. And this era gave to vegetable and animal life, as stepping stones to a higher life, new worth and meaning.

The assertion that the advent of reason reveals the operation of a new force different from, and higher than, the forces at work in brutes is not inconsistent with, and therefore is not disproved by, the suggestion that the bodies of men were developed from those of animals. For, just as, before the origin of life, the chemical elements out of which was woven the mysterious garb of life already existed in simpler forms, so it is quite conceivable that the new breath of reasoning life was breathed, not into inorganic matter, but into already existing animal forms. At the origin of life the new vital impulse must have built up existing elements into new chemical combinations. And so probably the inbreathed higher life of man developed for itself a suitable visible form. This would most easily account for the close similarity of men to animals and for the great interval between the forms of the highest animals and those of the lowest men.

We have now found clear indications of THREE DISTINCT IMPULSES, those creating motion, life, reason, each revealing (unless matter and motion were simultaneous in origin) the advent of a new force, each creating a new era in the history of our planet, an era which in each case gave meaning to all that preceded it.

The rarity of these new eras warns us not to accept without most careful scrutiny phenomena apparently new as evidence of the advent of a new force. The

only sufficient evidence is a large group of well-attested phenomena differing in kind from all observed results of known forces. Such phenomena we have found in each of the eras noted above.

Around JESUS OF NAZARETH are grouped well-attested phenomena differing as widely from all previous phenomena as do those which surround the origin of motion, of life, and of reason. And these new phenomena reveal in His day the advent into human life of a new influence.

When Christ was born, the nations of the world seemed to be rapidly GRAVITATING TO RUIN. In the Roman Empire, under the guise of imperial might there was everywhere corruption and exhaustion. The Greek nation was living, amid the ruins of the past, upon the memories of the past. Over the nations of the East already reigned stagnation and decay. The wild tribes of the North had not yet emerged from barbarism. Throughout the world, overcast by gloom, was scarcely a ray of hope.

Silently and imperceptibly an unseen Hand BEGAN TO ARREST the apparently inevitable ruin. There was no suspension of the moral and social forces which seemed to be overturning the foundations of society. But in the midst of the ruin germs of new life appeared, and began to grow. At first it seemed as though they would be overborne by the tremendous forces of evil around. But the new life survived the storms which threatened to destroy it. Gradually Christianity overspread and changed the Roman Empire. To-day,

instead of the ruin which in the days of Christ reigned everywhere we have all around us sustained progress. And, more wonderful still, that progress is to-day, and for long centuries has been, found only in those nations which acknowledge the supreme dignity of the Prophet of Nazareth. This wonderful change in the condition and prospects of our race involves no suspension of the moral forces which once seemed to be hurrying it to destruction. But it reveals the advent of a new force mightier than the forces of evil then reigning with almost undisputed sway. That these wonderful effects are limited to the Christian nations, points to the channel through which this influence operated upon mankind. It reveals the presence in Jesus of Nazareth of a moral Power higher than the moral forces operating upon men before His day.

That this new moral force, which arrested the apparently irresistible forces of evil which seemed to be destroying mankind, MODIFIED DIRECTLY THE OPERATION OF THE FORCES AT WORK IN THE MATERIAL WORLD, need not surprise us. For, so closely related are the moral and the material that whatever affects the one affects also the other. In consequence of the wickedness of those among whom He lived, taken in connection with the mortality of human nature, the body of Christ was prematurely, after a violent death, laid in the grave. His body was thus apparently given up to the corruption which, in consequence of the chemical affinities of their constituents; claims as its prey the bodies of all the dead. Need we wonder that,

in the body of Him through whom was arrested the moral corruption which threatened to destroy the human race, was arrested also the material corruption which in all others follows death, that even the hand of death was compelled to release its prey and that the Dead One came forth living from the grave? Such arrest of threatened corruption by no means implies suspension of those chemical forces which, in all the dead, reduce into simpler compounds the very complex compounds which compose living bodies. It implies only that in the body of Jesus had lived a life higher than that which lives in us; that just as in all living bodies the hand of life holds back certain chemical forces which otherwise would soon dissolve them, so this higher life either held back, even in the dead body of Christ, the progress of bodily corruption, or perhaps more likely rolled back a corruption already begun; and breathed life again into that lifeless form. Certainly the force or Power which at the first built up the simple chemical combinations of inorganic matter into the complex carbon compounds and gave to lifeless matter the forms and functions of life could raise out of the decaying body of the Crucified the living body of the Risen Saviour. THE ORIGIN OF LIFE IS AS MUCH AND AS LITTLE A MIRACLE AS IS THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. Each event differs altogether from all earlier phenomena: each of them is incapable of explanation by the known forces previously at work: and consequently each reveals the operation of a force or Power higher than these earlier forces.

Each of these new forces produced NEW PHENOMENA WHICH HAVE CONTINUED TO OUR DAY, and which are abiding witnesses of the impulses which gave them birth. Since its origin, life has continued on our planet. But the development of the living out of the lifeless has never been observed by human research. For all we know, it ceased with the first great impulse which gave birth to life. Similarly, the moral impulse brought to bear on man through Jesus of Nazareth is attested to-day by material and moral progress which has replaced the hopeless corruption of His day; and by the fact that this progress is found only in Christian nations. But the peculiar mode in which this new moral force manifested itself in the material world, viz. the return to life of a dead body, is no longer seen. The resurrection of Christ was needful in order to attest the new revelation which He announced, a revelation which would have been powerless to save the world apart from the attestation thus given. But the repetition of this attestation in our day is needless. For the historical evidence that Christ rose from the dead is abundantly confirmed by the manifest effect of Christianity upon the world.

They who recognise in nature and in man (see Lectures II. and III.) an intelligent Hand working out through natural forces an intelligent and moral purpose will recognise also such moral purpose in the phenomena surrounding the origin of life. In other words, we may infer that the phenomena of life

were designed to teach the spiritual lessons which in this work we have learnt from them.

It is now evident that the resurrection of Christ is NO ISOLATED EVENT standing alone, unlike all other events, contradicting, and contradicted by, the well-attested uniformity of nature. It stands in line with the greatest events in the history of our planet, the origins of motion, of life, and of reason. Each of these is attested by abundant evidence. But each of them differs as much from the entire course of nature observed by man as does the resurrection of Christ.

In a later volume I hope to show that the servants of Christ have good reason to expect in the future another new manifestation of superhuman power bringing in ANOTHER NEW ERA, a consummation of all preceding eras, viz. the return of Christ to raise the dead and to set up an eternal kingdom. This hope rests entirely on our assurance that Christ has risen from the dead. Thus through His empty grave we see not only the smile of a pardoning God but a bright vision of a new Earth and Heaven.

It is now evident that the resurrection of Christ no more contradicts the observed order of the material world than do other events in the history of our planet, events attested by indisputable scientific evidence. At the same time, our review of the past suggests the possibility, and the teaching of Christ confirms the hope, of further and higher development in the future. But this prospect in no wise lessens our confidence in the present and observed order of nature. For the

analogy of the past assures us that any further development will be in harmony with the order already observed, and suggests that it will be a development of that which is noblest and best in the present creation, *i.e.* of the moral life of man in harmony with the moral principles interwoven into human thought as the supreme rule of human life. In short, every voice assures us that the future will be brighter than the past, and that its brightness will be for the righteous.

Another objection demands a moment's notice. It has been said that the SLOW PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY and the imperfect realisation of the Christian ideal in Christian nations and Churches and men disproves its divine origin; that if God had sent His Son into the world to be its Saviour and Lord He would have surrounded Him with credentials which would have banished all doubt and have brought all men to recognise His authority and obey His sway. Others go further and object that if there were an omnipotent ruler of the world He would not tolerate in it evil in the form either of sin or of suffering.

These objections assume that God must needs force the truth on man's intelligence and force man to go in the path marked out for him. But we have no proof that this would be for man's highest good. Irresistible intellectual proof in matters of morals, like the demonstrations of mathematics, and irresistible influences forcing man along the right path, would destroy moral freedom, would make moral discipline and even

morality itself impossible, and reduce men to mere machines. It would thus rob man of his noblest prerogative, that of free choice, and human life of its distinctive worth, viz. capacity for moral excellence. To say that God must needs at this tremendous cost FORCE HIS WILL UPON MEN, is absurd. And, if man is free, the partial effect of the Gospel on nations, Churches, and individuals is fully explained; and the objection based upon it falls to the ground.

That man has power to refuse blessings offered to him by God, we may infer with confidence from his SENSE OF FREEDOM, which is too strong and widespread to be a delusion; and from the moral injury resulting inevitably from a denial of his freedom. And if, for man's good, the Creator gave Him power to accept or refuse, we wonder not that even in His purpose of salvation He respects the freedom thus given and permits him to refuse the offered mercy. Admit this, and all is explained. Because man is free the progress of Christianity among the nations of the world and in the hearts of men has been hindered by all the influences which darken the mind and lead astray the heart of man. Because the Gospel is divine it has survived the opposition which threatened to destroy it, has become the recognised belief of all progressive nations, has cast aside many corruptions derived from the human imperfections of its advocates and adherents, and is purer and mightier to-day than ever before. In other words, the new life breathed into mankind by Christ has been moulded in its develop-

ment by the various forces and influences already operating in man's social and moral life. Among these influences must be reckoned the power of choice involved in man's mysterious endowment of personality. Hence the slow and somewhat fitful progress of the Gospel, and its partial reception.

This slow and fitful progress, hindered by pre-existent influences, is not peculiar to Christianity. Slow and irregular was the progress of SPIRITUAL LIFE under the OLD COVENANT. More than once in those early days the kingdom of God in ancient Israel seemed to be on the verge of extinction as a moral force among men. But it survived even the deep corruption of the Sacred Nation, and achieved its purpose as a needful preparation for the Gospel of Christ. Still slower was the yet earlier development of VEGETABLE and ANIMAL LIFE moulded and limited by pre-existent inorganic forces. At its first dawn and for long ages life gave no promise of the importance for which it was destined. And the rude forces of lifeless matter seemed ready to overwhelm it. But the early and tender forms of life survived and grew and developed, until it clothed the world with a robe of manifold and marvellous beauty.

Thus again and again in the history of our planet new eras have been introduced by the advent of forces not previously in operation. Amid pre-existent forces ONCE AND AGAIN NEW LIFE APPEARS with new laws of its own. Along these new lines, yet modified by existing forces, the new life has advanced from stage

to stage till in each case it transformed and ennobled the whole world.

We have now considered the most serious objections to the abundant and conspicuous teaching of the New Testament that Christ rose from the dead. As we have examined them, these objections have altogether vanished: and we have now nothing to set against the overwhelming evidence which attests that Jesus of Nazareth announced salvation for all who believe His words, that in support of this announcement He claimed to be the Son of God, and that in proof of this claim He rose from the dead. Some have thought that this last statement is contradicted by the uniform teaching of the book of Nature. And, in deference to their reading of it, they have dared to contradict the firm belief touching their Master of those who gained for Him the homage of all succeeding ages. But we have now seen that their daring contradiction is needless. Although Nature has nothing definite to say about the Gospel of Christ, it has nothing to say against it. Certainly there is nothing in the material world which compels us to reject the abundant evidence on which rests the Christian hope, and to believe that a delusion has rescued our race from ruin and has led it into a new path which for a thousand years has been a path of sustained progress.

LECTURE XXXIX.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS.

IT now remains for us to gather together the logical and practical results of our researches up to this point.

We have found COMPLETE HISTORICAL PROOF THAT THE BODY OF JESUS LAID DEAD IN THE GRAVE RETURNED TO LIFE.

We also found abundant documentary evidence that He spoke frequently and conspicuously about a Father in heaven, the Maker and Ruler of the world; and asserted that beyond the grave exact retribution awaits all men. This testimony, coming as it does from Him who was raised from the dead, we cannot question. Thus by the teaching of Christ our own inferences from the material world and from the inner and outer life of men are confirmed, or rather are raised to absolute certainty.

We have also found, in the harmonious teaching of the various types of thought in the New Testament, COMPLETE DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE THAT CHRIST CLAIMED TO BE, in a unique sense, THE SON OF GOD: and we have seen that this claim involves a new concep-

tion of God. This claim and this conception of God we must now accept as just and true. For, whereas it is in the last degree unlikely that they who gained for Christ the homage of mankind, were in serious error touching their Master, we cannot believe for a moment that the Conqueror of Death and the Light of the World misunderstood His own dignity and His relation to God. We are therefore compelled by irresistible evidence to recognise the Carpenter of Nazareth as the Architect of the Universe, the future Judge of all men, and the eternal Companion of God. And if so, we must recognise His birth and life and death and resurrection as the most stupendous events in the history of mankind.

We found abundant DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE THAT CHRIST PROCLAIMED THAT GOD RECEIVES INTO HIS FAVOUR, and will hereafter receive into eternal life, in spite of their past sins, ALL WHO BELIEVE these glad tidings of forgiveness. Even this good news of salvation, coming to us as it does from the empty grave of Christ, we dared not reject or doubt. Thus through that empty grave there shines upon us the smile of a pardoning God and the light of immortal life.

By similar documentary evidence we traced to the lips of Christ and still more abundantly to the pen of Paul and of the various writers of the New Testament another remarkable doctrine bearing closely on the forgiveness of sins. Indisputably these various writers agree to teach, and to represent Christ as teaching, that our pardon comes THROUGH HIS violent DEATH on the

cross, and that in order to gain for us this forgiveness He deliberately and voluntarily laid down His life. Even this remarkable doctrine, new to the thought of man except in prophetic outline in the Old Testament and very dimly in other ancient literature, we cannot now hesitate to accept with complete confidence.

All these doctrines, which we have traced by decisive documentary evidence to the lips of Christ, we must either accept as true or believe that the most conspicuous features of the teaching of Christ and His Apostles were a complicated tissue of errors. This most unlikely suggestion is now removed still further from the limits of possibility by the abundant evidence which forbids us to doubt that He who announced that He was about to die for our sins was raised from the dead in order that we may know that in Him we have eternal life. These doctrines are definite and assured results of our theological research.

These doctrines are a revelation from God to man, an unveiling of things unseen. As distinguished from the revelation of the existence and rule of God given to all men in the material world and in the inborn moral sense, which is a NATURAL AND UNIVERSAL REVELATION, this revelation given in Jesus Christ is SUPERNATURAL AND HISTORICAL and as yet LIMITED, although DESIGNED FOR ALL MEN. The earlier revelation, by evoking a sense of spiritual need, is a necessary preparation for the latter. The latter is the needful consummation of the former. For the natural revelation, in itself, cannot save. But, by awaking a

sense of need which it cannot supply, it is a sure pledge of a greater revelation to follow. Thus each revelation involves the other. This mutual dependence reveals the common source of the two revelations.

These results are independent of all questions touching the AUTHORSHIP or DATE, and even the TRUTHFULNESS of the books of the OLD TESTAMENT. For these are not in any way involved in my argument. The few references to the Old Testament which I have made assume only that it was much earlier than, and altogether independent of, the teaching of Christ. Similarly, the authorship and date of the books of the New Testament are involved only so far as I have stated plainly in the course of my work. And for all my statements I have produced complete evidence. The results we have attained are also independent of the special inspiration and the divine authority of Holy Scripture. Nor do they in any way assume its infallibility. For to such infallibility or special authority I have nowhere appealed. We have used the various documents of the Bible as we should use and test any other literary memorials of the past.

At the same time, the researches embodied in this volume reveal the UNIQUE DIGNITY of both the CHRISTIAN and the JEWISH SCRIPTURES among all the books written by men. For our knowledge of the teaching of Christ and our proof that He rose from the dead have been derived from the New Testament. Had not these early Christian documents been written, or had they not survived to our day, our faith would not

have the firm foundation on which it now rests securely. So complete is this documentary evidence, containing all that we need and nothing superfluous, and so needful for the accomplishment of the purpose for which Christ died, that we cannot attribute its composition and preservation to a mere fortunate accident. The absolute necessity, in order that Christ might become the Teacher and Saviour of all succeeding ages, of some such early and correct record as that contained in the New Testament proves that the record itself is part of the divine purpose of salvation. For this purpose must have included all that was needful for its accomplishment. It must therefore have included the documentary evidence without which Christ could not have become the Light and Life of the world.

The only satisfactory explanation of all the facts of the case is that God, who sent His Son into the world to proclaim a Gospel designed for all men in all ages, secured for future ages a record and exposition of this Gospel sufficiently accurate and extensive for the great purpose which God had in view. In this important sense and measure, the record is itself a gift of Him who gave His Son to die for man. Since this record was written by human hands, and since, as we shall see in another volume, whatever God does in man He does through the agency of the Holy Spirit, to the guidance of this Spirit of God we owe this accurate and sufficient record. This special guidance, which differs from all other spiritual guidance as the New Testament differs

from other books, is the INSPIRATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Moreover, if we accept the New Testament as a correct record of actual facts and of a supernatural revelation given by God to men in Jesus Christ, we cannot refuse to accept the OLD TESTAMENT as a substantially correct record of earlier and preparatory revelations given through Moses and the Prophets; and of the spiritual life thereby evoked. For indisputably the writers of the New Testament agree to accept, and to represent Christ as accepting, the Old Testament as a correct record of fact and as a decisive authority touching the relation of man to God. And if Christ was the divinely-given Light of the world and the Apostles His ambassadors to men, it is in the last degree unlikely that in a matter so important He and they were in serious error. Moreover the spiritual unity which underlies the various and very different documents of the Old Testament and its immense superiority, as a spiritual guide, to all contemporary literature reveal both the reality of the revelations of God which it records and the special divine inspiration of the record itself.

We now see that, although we did not bring to the Bible any preconceived opinion about its origin or authority but examined and tested it as we should any other documents, our theological research has revealed to us its unique dignity above all other literature as a correct and divinely-given record of supernatural revelations of infinite value given by God to man. In other words, although we cannot appeal to the special

inspiration and authority of Holy Scriptures in proof of the great facts of the Gospel, the Scriptures contain in themselves, tested by the ordinary principles of literary and historical criticism, complete proof of these facts; and, read in the light of these facts, they contain complete proof of their unique and divine authority.

At the same time, it seems to me very unsafe to attempt to foreclose, by appeal to this divine authority of Holy Scripture, questions of AUTHORSHIP OR DATE OR SMALL HISTORICAL DETAIL. It is especially unsafe to settle such questions in the Old Testament by casual allusions in the New. For the precise relation of the Bible to the facts therein recorded can be determined only by careful and consecutive study of the Bible itself. This will attest its substantial truthfulness as a record of facts and its absolute correctness as a record of revelations actually given by God to man. It will also reveal the extreme accuracy of the Bible in a multitude of apparently trifling details, details of great value as witnesses of the general truthfulness of the whole. But it seems to me unfair to infer from the proved truthfulness of the Bible in all that bears upon the Christian life its absolute infallibility in every topic it incidentally touches.

It will also be noticed that I have not appealed to the AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH as embodied either in ancient or modern creeds or formularies or as expressed in the faith of existing communions. Yet apart from such authority, we have obtained a firm historical and Biblical foundation for personal and

intelligent faith in Christ and in God. At the same time our argument has received important confirmation from the creeds and other embodiments of the Christian faith in various ages and Churches. For these witnesses have revealed to us the substantial unanimity of the followers of Christ in all ages and all Churches in their interpretation of the Christian documents and in their belief touching the dignity of Christ and the Gospel He preached. And the history of Christianity tells us that this belief has been the deep conviction of nearly all those who have done most for the moral and spiritual life of men. This remarkable agreement has confirmed strongly the results of our own researches. In other words, although our investigations were independent of dogma and of Church authority, they have received important confirmation from the history and the creeds of the Church and the Churches.

The GROUNDS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH are now evident. And they are very similar to the grounds on which rests our acceptance of the generalisations of Natural Science. Some of these last, we were taught in childhood. But we hold them to-day with a conviction resting securely on the accumulating experiences of mature life, of which experiences they are the only explanation. Similarly, the religious teaching received in childhood from parents and teachers we hold in manhood because it is the only conceivable explanation of a multitude of phenomena known to us by direct observation. These phenomena we have found in the material world, in the inner and outer life of ourselves

and others, and in the literature of the world. They accumulate day by day. And their accumulation increases the strength of the faith so remarkably confirmed. Thus both in Natural Science and in Theology we have a well-grounded and definite assurance touching things unseen derived by strictly logical processes from, and resting upon, a multitude of matters known to us by direct observation. We may therefore justly claim for Theology a PLACE AMONG THE SCIENCES. And, since it goes further than any other branch of research in explaining and unifying the various groups of phenomena and the various inductions derived from them, and since the matters with which it deals are the noblest which have ever engaged the thought of man, we may speak of Theology as the HIGHEST PHILOSOPHY.

It has been frequently asserted, and still more frequently assumed, that the grounds of the Christian faith lie outside the realm of knowledge in the domain of imagination, that God and the Unseen are essentially unknowable. This assertion or assumption has been disproved by the argument of this volume. For, accepting only phenomena which have come under our own observation, we have attained DEFINITE AND ASSURED RESULTS. We have found abundant evidence, capable of scientific investigation, that beyond and above the visible universe is an invisible Creator and Ruler and Father, and beyond the present life a life to come. And we have found a path marked out by our Father in heaven and leading to immortal life. All these are

therefore matters of knowledge. We can say, with a great teacher, "I know whom I have believed." And our belief rests on grounds as firm as those on which rests our acceptance of the best-attested generalisations of Natural Science. At the same time, in each case, the incompleteness of our explanation of the phenomena tells us that we tread the borderland of a vast Unknown. But this by no means destroys or lessens the reality and the value of our knowledge, so far as it goes. Moreover, in each case, in spite of its imperfection, our knowledge is a safe guide in action and ground of expectation. Our knowledge of that Unseen which makes for Righteousness is both the light of life and the dawn of the Eternal Day.

The MORAL AND SPIRITUAL RESULTS of our inquiry now demand attention. Our contemplation of the material world and of the doom of death written on all that lives reminded us that we must pass away. And under the shadow of death we clung to life. The various indications of retribution beyond the grave aroused in us a consciousness of personal sin and a fear of future punishment. We endeavoured to atone for past sins by present and future obedience. But, to our horror, we found ourselves unable to do that which our moral sense demanded. And this discovery of moral inability increased our fear of punishment. We cried for deliverance.

This cry found no response either in the material world or in our own moral sense, except that nature assured us that its Maker and Ruler is good and kind

While we lay under the dark shadow of condemnation and bondage we heard the voice of the Author of the great religious impulse which in a very real sense has saved the world. He confirmed our own moral intuitions about future retribution, thus increasing our fear of punishment. And His spotless and lofty example of human excellence revealed our own moral degradation. He claimed our unreserved loyalty to Himself: but we felt ourselves powerless to render the service He justly claims. Thus the earliest effect of the voice and example of Christ was to increase our sense of helplessness and ruin.

But Christ spoke to us again. He announced that God receives into His favour, in spite of their past sins, all who believe the good news of salvation. This announcement, coming as it does from Him who by resurrection from the dead was proved to be the Son of God, we could not hesitate to accept as true. And it supplied in part our deep spiritual need. It gave to us, what we vainly sought elsewhere, the forgiveness of past sins.

The great Teacher said, and His Apostles taught still more emphatically, that the pardon He proclaimed was won for men by His death upon the cross. In His cross they and we saw the infinite love which moved the Father to give His Son to save man. The love thus revealed became to us a firm ground of exultant hope and radiant joy, a joy which not even the darkest sorrows of life could dim. Our fear of punishment was now exchanged for confident expectation of

eternal life. And in that hope our wearied spirits found rest.

It is now evident that our theological researches have produced spiritual results of the highest importance.

These results, however, DO NOT SUPPLY fully OUR deep spiritual NEED. Indeed, unless other results follow those already attained will be useless. For our own moral sense leaves no room for doubt that God smiles only on those who go in the path which He has marked out. And our many efforts to do right have revealed a hostile power hindering us from doing what we know that God requires. As yet we have heard nothing about deliverance from this inward bondage. The justification taught by Paul is, as we have seen, a judicial act, the receiving of sinners as righteous. Unless this be followed by actual righteousness, it is a worthless fiction. In other words, justification through faith needs to be itself justified by an inward moral change corresponding to our changed relation to God. Of this, as yet, we have heard nothing.

At the same time, the earnestness of God's purpose to save man, attested by the gift of His Son to die for man, assures us that He will do everything needful to attain the purpose for which Christ died. The important moral teaching of Christ proves that to change the hearts and lives of men was a great part of the work He came to do. We notice also that the love of God revealed in the death of Christ is itself a powerful moral influence. To myriads of Christians, the tragedy of the Cross, taken in connection with God's manifest

hatred to sin, has been the strongest motive for doing right. This new motive has been to them the beginning of a new moral life. All this inspires hope that deliverance from the penalty of past sins will be followed by release from the present and future bondage of sin.

In another volume I hope to show that He who shed His blood for many for remission of sins gives, to all who believe His words, His Spirit to be in them a moral power from God breaking the fetters of sin, and the breath of a new life of devotion to God like the devotion of Christ. This Spirit of God, given to them by their ascended Lord, is Himself an indisputable confirmation of the promise of forgiveness which in their deep sin they dared to believe, and is their Guide and Strength along a path on which God smiles. By this Spirit of God, dwelling in all who believe the Gospel, is consummated the forgiveness obtained by faith. This great salvation from the dominion and stain of sin will be the next step in our theological research. It will reveal and impart to us a NEW LIFE IN CHRIST.

While tracing in this volume the path by which sinners are brought into the favour of God, a path stained with the blood of the Son of God, we became conscious of the presence in the Godhead of a Second Divine Person, the Eternal Son of our Father in heaven. In my next volume, while tracing the new life breathed by Christ into those who believe His words, we shall discover the presence of a Third Divine Person, Him-

self the breath of this new life, the Eternal Spirit of God. Thus will our search for Him whose Hand we traced in the material world and whose Voice we heard in the moral sense of men lead us into the presence of the mysterious Trinity. In other words, our search for personal salvation will give us a new, and in its measure complete, conception of God. And in this new conception of God we shall find a profound rest which even the storms of life and the deep shadow of death will not be able to disturb. Thus will our knowledge of God be to us even in the midst of the battle of life a vision of eternal glory.

THIS IS THE ETERNAL LIFE, THAT THEY MAY KNOW THEE THE ONLY TRUE GOD, AND HIM WHOM THOU HAST SENT, EVEN JESUS CHRIST.

Printed by Hazell, Watson, & Viney, Ld., London and Aylesbury.

GENERAL INDEX.

	PAGE
Abraham's Faith	97, 115.
Æschylus, quoted	225
Animals compared with Man	39, 349
Apollinaris, Teaching of	287
Aristotle's *Ethics*, quoted	70f
Ascension of Christ	309
Atonement, Rationale of the	187ff
Augsburg Confession, quoted	285
Belief, or Faith	105ff, 111ff
Buddha, Teaching of	5
Chalcedon, Council of	288
Christ and Adam	218
Christ, Birth of	274
Christ, Creator	219, 227
Christ, equal to God	241ff
Christ, our Example	62
Christ, the Death of	143ff
Christ, the Judge of the World	217, 226, 234
Christ, the Son of God	215f, 225, 232
Chrysippus	19
Church, Authority of	366
Cicero, quoted	18f, 28f
Constantinople, Council of	284, 287
Conversion	133
Covenant, or Testament	173f
Demosthenes, quoted	28
Dhammapada, quoted	33
Discrepancies in New Testament	340
Divinity of Christ	239
Ephesus, Council of	288
Ethics, Relation to Theology	8
Eusebius of Cæsarea, quoted	283
Eutyches, Teaching of	288
Faith, Nature of	105ff
Faith and Works	129ff
Freedom of the Will	357
God, Father and Ruler	59
God, Intelligent	15
God, Moral	26
Gospel of Christ, the	119ff
Gospels, the Four	52
Gravitation, Origin of	14
Homer, quoted	153
Incarnation of the Son	270ff
Inspiration of the Bible	365ff
Irenæus, quoted	52
Jassy, Synod of	285
Jewish Race, its Knowledge of God	47
John the Apostle	120
John the Baptist	81, 180
Josephus, quoted	169
Justice of God	157ff
Justification	92ff
Knowledge	107
Law of God	73f, 162f
Leo's Letter to Flavian	288
Life, Origin of	13, 347
Love of God	194

	PAGE
Marathon, Brigands at	201
Menenius Agrippa, Story of	267
Mind, Origin of	13
Miracles, Possibility of	345
Moral Sense, Origin of	22
Mother of God	289
Motion, Origin of	14, 347
Natural Forces	14
Nestorius, Teaching of	288
Nicæa, Council of	282f
Nicene Creed	283
Pardon	99
Paul, Epistles of	51f
Peace with God	99
Persia, Inferiority of	41
Personality of God	16
Philosophy	7, 368
Pius IV., Bull of	285
Plato, quoted	16f, 32
Propitiation	153ff
Ransom	149f
Reckoned for Righteousness	96ff
Reconciled to God	165ff
Redemption	149ff, 161, 183
Religion, Definition of	1ff
Religions of the World	38
Repentance	134f
Resurrection of Christ	302ff
Retribution beyond the Grave	30, 60
Revelation, the Universal	34
Righteousness	70ff
Righteousness of God	88ff
Righteousness through Faith	87ff
Science	7, 368
Second Coming of Christ	355
Septuagint Version	70
Sin, Universality of	79ff
Sin, Consciousness of	35
Sinai, Law of	73ff
Socrates, *Church History*, quoted	282
Son of God, the	215ff, 251ff
Sophocles, quoted	27
Spirit of God	258
Subordination of the Son	248ff
Synoptist Gospels, the	176ff, 231ff
Systematic Theology	7
Testament or Covenant	173f
Textual Criticism of the New Testament	51
Theology, Definition of	7f, 368
Transmigration	33
Trent, Council of	285
Valerius Maximus, quoted	200
Westcott on John, quoted	120
Xenophon, quoted	28, 31f
Zaleucus, Story of	200

INDEX TO THE PASSAGES OF HOLY SCRIPTURE EXPLAINED IN THIS VOLUME.

OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis.	page
xv. 6	97, 115
xl. 26	111
Exodus.	
iv. 1	111
xiii. 13	150
Leviticus.	
iv. 20ff	153
vi. 9	74
xix. 18f	76f
Deuteronomy.	
vi. 25	72
vii. 8	150
xxiv. 13	72
xxv. 1	94
xxx. 10	74
1 Samuel.	
xv. 29	134
xxvii. 12	111
xxix. 4	169
2 Samuel.	
iv. 9	150
1 Kings.	
ii. 3	74
viii. 32	94
Job.	
xxxii. 1	71
xxxii. 2	94
xxxiii. 32	94
Psalms.	
xiv. 1-3	80
li. 4	88
cvi. 31	98
Proverbs.	
iii. 1	73
xvii. 15	94
Isaiah.	
liii. 11	94
lv. 7	133
Jeremiah.	
iv. 28	134
xviii. 8ff	134
xxxi. 34	126
Ezekiel.	
xxxvi. 25	126
Daniel.	
vii. 13	235
xii. 3	94

NEW TESTAMENT.

Matthew.	page
v. 23f	168
vii. 21	123
vii. 23	234
ix. 2, 6	124
ix. 22	123
xii. 28	276
xii. 31f	124
xii. 37	93, 132
xii. 41	135
xiii. 15	133
xvii. 20	123
xix. 17	123
xx. 28	178
xxi. 21	123
xxiv. 36	277
xxvi. 28	124, 178
xxvi. 53	276
xxvii. 46	179
xxviii. 19	246
Mark.	
i. 4	81
i. 15	123
viii. 27ff	176
Luke.	
i. 6	71
i. 35	274
ii. 41-52	275
iii. 22	275
iv. 1	275
viii. 12	123
ix. 18ff	176
x. 29	94
xi. 32	135
xiii. 3, 5	134
xvi. 11	113
xvi. 15	94

PAGE

xxii. 20 . . 178
xxiv. 47 . . 124

JOHN.

i. 1 . . 227, 244
i. 3 . . . 227
i. 14 . . 244, 273
i. 29 . . . 180
ii. 24 . . . 112
ii. 25 . . . 277
iii. 15ff . 121, 208
iii. 16, 18 . . 225
v. 19 . . 242, 249
v. 20 . . 242, 250
v. 22, 26 . . 249
vi. 44 . . . 136
vi. 57 . . . 250
vi. 65 . . . 137
viii. 34 . . 81
x. 15, 17 . . 180
x. 30 . . 241, 262
x. 32 . . . 181
xi. 51 . . . 180
xii. 24, 32 . . 181
xiv. 9. . . 242
xiv. 27 . . 91
xiv. 28 . 243, 254
xv. 9f . . . 246
xv. 25 . . 74
xvi. 15 . . 242
xvii. 5 . . . 245
xvii. 11 . 260, 262
xvii. 21-23 . 260, 262
xvii. 24 . . 246
xx. 28 . . 227

ACTS.

v. 34 . . . 171
xiii. 39 . . 96
xiii. 43 . . 1
xxvi. 5 . . 1

ROMANS.

i. 4 . . . 215
i. 16-18 67, 87, 89, 92
i. 18-32 . . 79
ii. 2-13 . . 132
ii. 4f . . . 136
ii. 12 . . . 75
ii. 13 . . 93, 131
ii. 14f . . . 76
ii. 27 . . . 75

PAGE

iii. 2 . . . 113
iii. 4 . . . 93
iii. 5 . . . 88
iii. 9 . . . 80
iii. 19 . . 74, 83
iii. 21 . 68, 87, 89, 92, 96
iii. 24 . . 92, 143
iii. 25 . . . 88
iii. 26 . 88, 160, 195
iv. 3 . . 96, 115
iv. 20f . . 116
v. 1 . . . 99
v. 6-10 . . 144
v. 8 . . . 80
v. 10 . . 99, 166ff
v. 12ff . 204, 218
vii. 4 . . . 162
viii. 3 . . . 82
ix. 31 . . . 72
x. 3 . . . 89
x. 5 . . . 75
xiv. 9 . . . 146

1 CORINTHIANS.

i. 17 . . . 144
v. 7 . . . 144
vii. 11 . . . 168
x. 16 . . . 144
xi. 25 . . . 145
xv. 12 . . 302
xv. 22 . . . 204

2 CORINTHIANS.

v. 15 . . . 147
v. 18ff . . 80, 100
v. 21 . . . 90
viii. 9 . . . 270

GALATIANS.

i. 4 . . . 147
ii. 19 . . . 163
iii. 13 . . 145, 163
iii. 17 . . . 85
iii. 22 . . . 84
iv. 9 . . . 133
v. 13ff . . . 132
vi. 12, 14 . . 145

EPHESIANS.

i. 9 . . . 207
ii. 1-3 . . . 80
ii. 14 . . . 164
v. 25 . . . 147

PAGE

PHILIPPIANS.

ii. 6 . . 241, 271f
ii. 9ff . . . 207
iii. 9 . . . 90
iv. 7 . . . 91

COLOSSIANS.

i. 16f . . 219, 245
i. 20 . . . 207
ii. 13f. . . 163

1 THESSALONIANS.

i. 9 . . . 133

1 TIMOTHY.

ii. 1, 4 . . 208

2 TIMOTHY.

ii. 25 . . . 137

TITUS.

ii. 11 . . . 208

HEBREWS.

i. 2 . . . 221
i. 4ff . . . 221
ii. 9, 10, 14 . . 172
ii. 17 . . . 272
iii. 5f . . . 220
ix. 16 . . . 173f

JAMES.

ii. 21 . . . 132

1 PETER.

i. 18 . . . 183
ii. 24 . . . 183
iii. 18 . . . 183

1 JOHN.

i. 7, 9 . . . 182
ii. 2 . . 182, 208
iii. 16 . . . 182
iv. 9 . . . 225
iv. 10 . . . 182

REVELATION.

i. 5 . . . 184
i. 17 . . . 229
ii. 7 . . . 229
iii. 5 . . . 229
v. 6, 9 . . 184
vii. 15 . . 184
xix. 10 . . 230
xxii. 9 . . 230

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Fifth Thousand, cloth boards, 1s.

THE FIRM FOUNDATION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH:

A HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES FOR SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS.

Contents:

1.—Religion and Theology. 2.—The Visible and the Invisible. 3.—The Moral Sense of Man. 4.—Retribution beyond the Grave. 5.—Christianity and Christ. 6.—The Christian Documents. 7.—The Moral Teaching of Christ. 8.—The Gospel of Christ. 9.—The Son of God. 10.—The Resurrection of Christ. 11.—Objections. 12.—Summary of Results. 13.—The Authority of Holy Scripture.

"We do not know any book so well suited for this purpose."—Dr. Marcus Dods in The Expositor.

"*Multum in Parvo.* A book which in a few pages sets forth a great and weighty argument in a style perfectly clear and easily understood is surely a great boon. Dr. Beet has conferred a great benefit, not merely on the Wesleyan Methodist Church and her Teachers, he has made all the Churches a debtor to him."—Professor Iverach in The Thinker.

"The Christian documents, the person of Christ, and the authority of Holy Scripture, and all the other great questions of the Christian faith, are treated with breadth, and at the same time with a clearness and definiteness that leave little to be desired. The book is one which should prove exceedingly valuable to those who wish to expound Christian truth successfully to the senior classes of intelligent young artisans and their sisters, who are now to be found attending the Sunday Schools of the country, but at the same time eagerly questioning the grounds upon which rested the faith of their fathers. Dr. Beet has many of the highest qualities necessary in a theologian who is to be a successful and helpful teacher at a transitional period in the history of theological thought."—Daily Chronicle.

WESLEYAN METHODIST SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION,
2 AND 3, LUDGATE CIRCUS BUILDINGS, LONDON, E.C.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, 1s.

HOLINESS,

As Understood by the Writers of the Bible.

CONTENTS.

I. Method of Study.
II. Holiness in the Books of the Law.
III. Holiness in the Later Books of the Old Testament.
IV. Holiness in the Septuagint Version and in the Apocrypha.
V. Holiness in the New Testament.
VI. Holiness in Jesus Christ.
VII. Holiness of the Followers of Christ.
VIII. Christian Holiness, the True Explanation of the Mosaic Ritual.
IX. Holiness as Opposed to Sin.
X. How we become Holy.
XI. Growth in Holiness.
XII. The Excellence of Holiness.

APPENDIX.

The Holiness of God. Christian Purity.

"I go along entirely with almost every word of it."—DEAN VAUGHAN.
"It is among the books nearest to our mind upon this much-canvassed subject."—C. H. SPURGEON.

Second Edition. Crown 8vo, 1s.

A TREATISE OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

CONTENTS.

I. The Teaching of the New Testament. Note on the word Covenant.
II. The Baptism of Infants. Note on Proselyte Baptism.
III. Baptismal Regeneration.
IV. The Significance and Benefit of the Baptism of Infants.
V. The Relation of Baptised Children to the Church.

APPENDIX.

References to Baptism by Early Christian Writers

"A very fair and useful handbook."—LITERARY CHURCHMAN.
"Fine candour, catholic spirit, real ability."—DR. CLIFFORD.

LONDON: HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW.